FBIS DAILY REPORT CONTENTS

Soviet Union

Vol III No 208 28 October 1986

USSR INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS

ARMS CONTROL & DISARMAMENT

BILD Reports Soviet Superiority in Space Defense [Hamburg, 25 Oct] AA 1
Gashkov on Strategic-Weapon, INF, ABM Proposals AA 2
PRAVDA Challenges Logic of U.S. SDI Defenders [Georgiyev, 25 Oct] AA 3
PRAVDA Hits SDI-Gas Mask Link, U,S. CW Policy [Georgiyev, 27 Oct] AA 5
Opportunity U.S. 'Missed' in Reykjavik Remains [IZVESTIYA Editorial 25 Oct] AA 6
Further on Gorbachev 12 October News Conference AA 8
Correction to Television Version AA 8
PRAVDA Second Edition Version [14 Oct] AA 10
Burlatskiy 'Open Letter' to Perle on Reykjavik [LITERATURNAYA GAZETA 22 Oct] AA 24
Strategic Arms Group Confers in Geneva AA 29
Space Arms Group Meets in Geneva 28 Oct AA 29

WORLD & REGIONAL ISSUES

Gorbachev Replies to Organizers of Writers' Forum [PRAVDA 28 Oct] CC 1
Bulgarian Chairman Briefs Press CC 2
CSSR News Conference on CSCE Preparations CC 3

CHINA

PRC-GDR Cooperation Agreement Signed in Beijing B 1
Joint PRC Power Equipment Agreement Signed B 1
Culture Minister Zakharov Attends PRC Ballet [PRAVDA 23 Oct] B 1
Condolences on Ye Jianying Death Sent to PRC [IZVESTIYA 27 Oct] B 2
PRC Rejects Possible U.S. Nuclear Port Calls [KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 24 Oct] B 2
Savenkov on PRC State Control of Enterprises [IZVESTIYA 27 Oct]

NORTHEAST ASIA

Continued Coverage of Kim Il-song Visit C 1
Talks With Gorbachev [PRAVDA 25 Oct] C 1
More on Talks [PRAVDA 26 Oct] C 2
Kremlin Dinner C 2
Gorbachev Dinner Speech [PRAVDA 26 Oct] C 3
Kim Il-song Dinner Speech [PRAVDA 26 Oct] C 6
PRAVDA Notes Kim Activities [27 Oct] C 9
Farewell Ceremony C 10

Honecker Begins Talks With Batmonh in MPR C 10
Departs After Visit C 11
Chairman of GOSSNAB Receives MPR's Gotob [IZVESTIYA 22 Oct] C 11
AUCCTU's Delegation Returns From Mongolia [TRUD 19 Oct] C 11

SOUTH ASIA

Last of Six Regiments Leaves DRA for Home D 1
Dobrynin Meets With Indian Communist Official D 1
[PRAVDA 26 Oct]
Indian Metallurgical Cooperation Protocol Signed D 2
[Karmalito in SOTSIALISTICHESKAYA INDUSTRIYA 19 Oct]

WESTERN EUROPE

TASS Details USSR-France Joint Space Mission G 1
TASS Views Kohl Interview on Washington Visit [Shestakov] G 1
Shikin Appointed Ambassador to Austria G 2
[Vienna DIE PRESSE 18-19 Oct]

MIDDLE EAST & NORTH AFRICA

Reportage on UK Diplomatic Break With Syria H 1
UK Relations With Syria H 1
Syria Severs Relations H 1
TASS on Anti-Syrian 'Campaign' H 1
TASS on U.S. Response H 1
Canada Recalls Envoy H 2
TASS on British Action H 2
UK Action Aids U.S. [Shabayev] H 3
PRAVDA: UK Act 'Provocative' [Peresada 26 Oct] H 4
Attempt to Link USSR H 5
'Intense Anti-Syrian Campaign' [Pakhomov 27 Oct] H 6

SUB-SAHARAN AFRICA

Further Report, Comment on Death of Machel J 1
Aliyev Meets Nicaraguan J 1
PRAVDA on South African Role [27 Oct] J 1
TASS on Circumstances of Crash J 1
RPP Discusses Causes of Crash J 2

NATIONAL AFFAIRS

POLITICAL & SOCIAL DEVELOPMENTS

'Law and Order' Becomes New Chernobyl Concern R 1
Property Policing Stepped Up [PRAVDA 27 Oct] R 1
Looters Face Charges [Zhukovskiy in SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA 13 Oct] R 1
Economists Discuss Role of Tax in Income Sphere R 3
[Shatalin, Grebennikov in EKONOMICHESKAYA GAZETA No. 42, Oct]
Ukraine's Masik 'Transferred to Another Job' R 8
[PRAVDA UKRAINY 18 Oct]

SCIENTIFIC AFFAIRS

October Satellite Launchings Reported U 1
Cosmos-1786, 1787 Launched [PRAVDA 23 Oct] U 1
Cosmos-1788 Launched 27 Oct U 1
Raduga Satellite Launched [PRAVDA 28 Oct] U 1
Space Project To Research Mercury's Moons U 2
Proton Rocket Carriers To Be Sold Commercially U 2
Antarctic Expedition To Set Up New Base U 2

BILD REPORTS SOVIET SUPERIORITY IN SPACE DEFENSE

DW262055 Hamburg BILD in German 25 Oct 86 p 8

[Wolfgang Kenntemich article: "Secret Paper: Russians More Advanced With SDI Than U.S."]

[Text] The Soviets are more advanced with SDI (missile defense in space) than the United States: They disabled at least three American space reconnaissance satellites by means of laser guns launched from the surface. That is indicated in top-secret U.S. and NATO documents. BILD gives details for the first time:

-- In 12 research centers about 10,000 Soviet scientists and engineers are currently working on high-energy laser programs for missile defense.

One of the biggest laser weapons plants is in Troitsk (Irkutsk). A prototype of the strategic defense laser is in Sary-Chaganak (Kazakhstan). From there the U.S. satellites can be "blinded" (that means optics and electronics are completely destroyed) by an optical system that reroutes the beams.

-- Research and development of surface and space laser beam weapons have been carried out since 1970.

-- With the SA-X12 the Soviets are building a defense missile against short-range, medium-range, and intercontinental missiles (some thousand missiles are planned to be built, their code name is: GIANT).

The mobile antimissile system has been successfully tested in Siberia against soviet SCUD-B medium-range missiles and against a copied Pershing 2.

-- The Soviets have dramatically increased the number of their transportable SA-10 air-defense missiles since the beginning of the eighties -- now there are 1,400 launching bases in about 150 positions. They are protecting military facilities, key industries, and the capital. Some 50 percent of them are based around Moscow.

-- Moscow's antimissile system with 64 launching devices of the "GALOSH" type has been modernized.

-- Two new radar devices were installed near Moscow: FLAT TWIN as a target tracking radar, PAN SHOP for controlling the defense missiles.

In addition to that there is the existing PUSHKINO radar device (size like a pyramid, 120 meters lateral length, 40 meters high).

-- A new giant radar (120 degrees coverage range, 4,000 kilometers range) is under construction near Krasnoyarsk (Irkutsk).

CDU/CSU disarmament expert Todenhoefer says: "That confirms: In fact the Soviets are many years ahead of the Americans in the research and the design of antimissile systems and laser weapons."

GASHKOV ON STRATEGIC-WEAPONS, INF, ABM PROPOSALS

LD261953 Moscow Televsion Service in Russian 1530 GMT 26 Oct 86

[From the "Vremya" newscast; Commentator Georgiy Sedov interviews Colonel General Ivan Andreyevich Gashkov, deputy chief of the General Staff; Sedov and Gashkov, identified by caption, shown seated in studio; date and place not given -- recorded]

[Text] [Announcer] The USSR-U.S. top-level meeting in Reykjavik and Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev's appearance on Soviet television have provoked a large influx of letters from television viewers.

[Sedov] The editorial office has prepared several questions and acquainted Colonel General Gashkov, deputy chief of General Staff of the USSR Armed Forces, with these in advance. So, the first question, Ivan Andreyevich:

As everyone knows, at the meeting in Reykjavik the Soviet side proposed to reduce USSR and U.S. strategic offensive weapons by 50 percent in the first 5 years and to eliminate them altogether over the next 5 years. This was confirmed in Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev's speech on television. Are we not placing our security under threat, considering the availability of such weapons to third countries?

[Gashkov] The proposals for reduction in strategic weapons which were presented by Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev, CPSU Central Committee general secretary, in Reykjavik were considered in the context of total elimination of nuclear weapons on earth in accordance with the Soviet statement of 15 January this year.

It is obvious to the United States of America and the Soviet Union that, being the most powerful nuclear powers in the world, if over the first 5 years they reduced their nuclear arsenals by 50 percent they would not thereby place the security of their peoples under threat from third countries. The Soviet Union constructs its policy, taking into consideration the whole range of real factors, so that questions of reducing strategic offensive weapons are solved on the basis of equality and equal security of the sides, without attempting to conduct negotiations and reach agreements from a position of strength. Our state is not striving to achieve military superiority nor will it allow violations of the existing military-political balance. We are proceeding from the concept that when agreement is reached on reducing strategic offensive weapons by 50 percent in the first stage and the reduction is implemented, accords may be reached on third countries joining in the process.

[Sedov] Our country has agreed to the elimination of Soviet and U.S. medium-range missiles in Europe, leaving aside corresponding nuclear weapons of Britain and France. Will this not create unilateral military advantages for the NATO bloc?

[Gashkov] The NATO block would not get a unilateral military advantage in this situation. At the same time as the Soviet SS-20 missiles, U.S. Pershing-2 missiles and land-based cruise missiles would be eliminated in Europe. The necessary balance in Europe would be maintained with the sides' other nuclear assets, while the global balance in the world would be guaranteed by the approximate equality in the strategic nuclear forces of the Soviet Union and the United States of America.

We understand the seriousness of the solution we are taking upon ourselves: to leave aside and not take into consideration Britain's and France's nuclear potential. This decision was not easy for the Soviet Union, but its adoption emphasizes the Soviet Union's sincere desire to demonstrate not in words but in action our striving to search for ways toward accords on universal nuclear disarmament.

The reduction of the Soviet Union's and United States' medium-range nuclear weapons as well as the involvement of other countries in that process would significantly reduce the world tension and promote futher improvement in international relations. Therein lies the political significance of the solution on this issue.

[Sedov] The U.S. Administration has declared that it is going to test SDI components, alleging that this does not contravene the ABM Treaty. What can you say on the subject, as a military man?

[Gashkov] The open-ended Soviet-U.S. 1972 Treaty on Limiting Antimissile Defense Systems has long stabilized the strategic situaton in the world by holding back the race in strategic offensive weapons. This important aspect of the treaty is set out in its preamble, which says that effective measures for limiting antimissile defense systems have become substantial factors in restraining the race in strategic offensive weapons and would contribute to the creation of more favorable conditions for subsequent negotations on strategic weapons.

As for the issue of tests, the treaty explicitly and unambiguously prohibits them. Article 5 of the treaty states, I quote: The ABM Treaty prohibits the creation, testing, or deployment of sea-based, air-based, space-based, or land-mobile antimissile defense systmes or components.

However, as we all know, the United States of America plans to have space-based components within the context of the SDI program. All this is directed at violating and ultimately undermining the ABM Treaty, as has already been done with SALT II. The United States demonstrated this objective in Reykjavik, where, for the sake of SDI, they did not agree to strengthening the conditions of the ABM Treaty and thereby wrecked possible accords. Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev confirmed this once more in his speech on television.

PRAVDA CHALLENGES LOGIC OF U.S. SDI DEFENDERS

PM271400 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 25 Oct 86 First Edition p 4

[K. Georgiyev article: "More About Logic"]

[Text] In his 22 October speech on Soviet television, M.S. Gorbachev spoke of the campaign launched in the United States to whitewash the destructive position of the American Administration, which came to the Reykjavik meeting unprepared, with the same old baggage and, finding there was no way out and that the situation demanded clear answers, wrecked the possibility of ending the meeting with accords. As M.S. Gorbachev said, the main efforts were invested in the defense of SDI, which was put to shame in Reykjavik.

In this context I would like to dwell on some of the methods resorted to by the defenders of SDI.

For instance, in the attempt to substantiate the logic behind the position adopted on SDI by President Reagan in Reykjavik, it is stressed that in putting forward the proposal to replace the ABM Treaty with a new treaty governing the creation [sozdaniye] and deployment [razvertyvaniye] of space ABM systems, the President said such a treaty would make the number of defense systems deployed dependent on the number of ballistic missiles remaining.

If we adopt this approach as a hypothesis, according to the laws of simple logic and ordinary arithmetic it must mean that since the sides are agreed on reducing the number of all strategic arms (which, of coursel includes ballistic missiles) to zero over a 10-year period, the number of space ABM systems which it is planned to deploy at the end of the 10 years must also be zero. That all looks clear enough: Once there is no sword, there is no need for a shield.

However, it transpires that Washington follows a different logic. According to its reasoning, even given zero ballistic missiles, the United States would have the "right" to deploy "x" number of space ABM systems.

How, one wonders, can the value of this "x" be calculated in relation to zero? This is a task which clearly belongs to the category that scientists call invalid. It can hardly be resolved even by means of mathematical logic (may mathematicians forgive me).

But since the White House does not get on at all well with logic, even generally accepted logic, it decided to confuse the issue even more. Let us share with you, with the Soviet Union, representatives of the American Administration say, this mysterious "x," and then one side will have, say, "y" space systems created by SDI, while the other will also have "y" such systems.

We will let future generations of mathematicians resolve this ultra-invalid problem. M.S. Gorbachev has already replied to what lies behind the American proposal.

First, he clearly told the President that the Soviet Union does not intend in any event to copy the American SDI program -- our response to it, if matters reach the stage of practical implementation, will be effective, but asymmetrical; what precisely, time will tell.

Second, as is well known from M.S. Gorbachev's 14 October speech on Soviet television, the President was told frankly that we do not take seriously the idea of sharing SDI developments with the Soviet Union. One can hardly believe in the seriousness of that promise, when the United States will not now even share oil or dairy equipment with the Soviet Union.

It seems that the President took offense at this observation, stating that he would cancel SDI if he thought it would be impossbile to share its results.

That is expressed strongly enough. But what emerged, on investigation? When American journalists started asking presidential national security adviser Poindexter what precisely the United States will be prepared to share with the Soviet Union, his answers at once confirmed what the Soviet leader said.

Whereas the President, in speaking of his readiness to share the results of SDI work with the USSR, talked about the transfer of the "technology," "systems," and "means" of ABM defense, Poindexter, answering journalists' questions, sang an entirely differnt tune. "It is possible to envision a kind of transfer of technology," he stated, "in which both sides would not necessarily have the equipment or their control systems that could be shared" (?!).

Later, in response to the natural persistence of the journalists, who wanted him to clarify this blatantly illogical formulation, there was the following statement from Poindexter: [paragraph continues]

"That doesn't mean that we would share the technology. But one can envision arrangements where both sides would have access to some sort of a command-and-control system that would command the sensors and defensive weapons."

There were, as the saying goes, no further questions. The "dialectical" nature of the logic followed in the White House became clear to everyone -- it turned out (incidentally, it was clear to the Soviet leadership from the first, as we have seen) that "sharing" means at the same time "not sharing," and "transferring" means first "transferring who knows what," and then "transferring nothing."

That is Washington's logic for you.

PRAVDA HITS SDI-GAS MASK LINK, U.S. CW POLICY

PM271641 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 27 Oct 86 First Edition p 5

[K. Georgiyev article: "On SDI and Gas Masks"]

[Text] Any sober-minded person obviously cannot help but ask: What do gas masks have to do with the American "Star Wars" program? But it is a well-known fact that Washington has woven a great many tales to advertise SDI.

This is one of them -- comparing a space-based ABM system, whose development [razrabotka] is being carried out within the framework of the SDI program, to a gas mask. U.S. President R. Reagan resorts to this more than original comparison particularly frequently, evidently considering it to be highly successful and persuasive. In his television address to the country the day after the meeting in Reykjavik had ended, telling how he had tried to convince M.S. Gorbachev of the reasonableness and necessity of creating [sozdaniye] a space-based ABM system even if offensive ballistic missiles were totally eliminated, the President said: "I compared this to the fact that we have kept our gas masks even though all the countries of the world have banned toxic gases since World War I."

Let us objectively analyze the meaning of this statement -- and we will discover the truth! Leaving aside at present whether one can conceivably compare such incomparable objects as space-based strike weapons and gas masks, we will first examine whether the initial premise regarding the preservation of gas masks is actually correct, despite the fact that the President has said "all the countries of the world have banned toxic gases."

In actual fact, toxic gases -- like other types of chemical weapons -- have unfortunately still not been banned. The 1925 Geneva protocol, which is what the President obviously has in mind, only bans their USE [published in bold face], but stockpiles of these weapons and new production of them are not banned.

It is also not inappropriate to recall that, unlike the Soviet Union and the majority of other states, the United States ratified the 1925 Geneva protocol only in 1975, that is, 50 years after its appearance and 30 years after World War II -- certainly not after World War I. Meanwhile the United States resorted to the extensive use of chemical warfare during its aggression in Vietnam. Is it surprising, therefore, that people prefer to hold onto their gas masks under these conditions?

If an international convention has still not been concluded which would ban chemical weapons as such and guarantee the elimination of stockpiles, as well as the industrial base for the production of this type of mass destruction weapons -- which, incidentally, would make the retention of gas masks pointless -- the blame also lies primarily with the United States. The draft of this convention was submitted by the Soviet Union and other socialist countries to the Geneva Disarmament Committee back in 1972. This, as we saw, pushed the United States in the direction of at least ratifying the 1925 Geneva protocol, in an evident wish to "defuse the situation."

However, even after this, for many years the United States has obstructed the drawing up of a convention totally banning and eliminating chemical weapons and, what is more, it is forcing the pace of creating [sozdaniye] new types of these weapons, still more lethal, against which no gas masks could afford any protection. Only under the influence of persistent efforts by the Soviet Union, which has put forward far-reaching proposals in this sphere also, has any improvement been noted at talks on drawing up a convention -- quite recent improvement.

Such is the situation with toxic gases and gas masks. As we can see, the very premise on which the equation of SDI and the gas mask is based is false.

The main thing, however, is whether it is at all possible, in any rational sense, to compare a gas mask -- with which it would hardly be possible to kill anyone (if one were to hit someone on the head with it, for example) with a colossal space-based system which could be used both as a directly offensive weapon and as a "shield" behind which a first nuclear strike could be carried out.

One must assume that Washington came up with these comparisons from force of circumstance.

OPPORTUNITY U.S. 'MISSED' IN REYKJAVIK REMAINS

PM271235 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 25 Oct 86 Morning Edition p 1

[Editorial: "A Responsible Approach Is Needed"]

[Text] A great deal has already been written about the Reykjavik meeting. Both here and abroad. The meeting was an important event in international life. It would be no exaggeration to say that the attention of billions of people was immediately riveted on it: After all, fundamental questions of world politics -- the cessation of the arms race and nuclear disarmament -- were being raised in Reykjavik.

There are, as it were, two dimensions to the history of the meeting: It can be measured in a few weeks and in 4 decades. It took less than 2 weeks to organize it. But those weeks absorbed all that mankind had experienced in the 4 decades since the summer of 1945\at the test site in New Mexico, when the atomic device was exploded and a new era -- the nuclear era -- began. The eternal agony of those who died during the atom bombing of Hiroshima and Nagasaki and the eternal suffering of those who survived the bombs but cannot forget the deaths of loved ones; anger at the creation of more and more increasingly sophisticated nuclear weapon system' and bitterness because the tireless efforts to eliminate once and for all the threat of a worldwide catastrophe have not yet averted that threat -- these have been notable features of the 4 decades.

Meanwhile the nuclear era is gathering pace. What will the world be like at the junction between the second and third millennia? Will it have been possible to establish a new era without weapons and wars, or will the nuclear era carry on into the year 2000?

In suggesting the Reykjavik meeting the Soviet Union was prompted by one concern: a sincere wish to adopt the kind of measures which would make it possible to achieve a cardinal breakthrough in the world situation. It is impossible to do this alone. The other side must have the same intentions, the same resolve and willingness to enter the new millennium having shed and having relieved mankind of the nuclear burden, the burden of death.

Of course, intentions and aspirations alone are not enough. There have been quite enough protestations of love of peace as it is. Action is needed. It was with a proposal for concrete action that CPSU Central Committee General Secretary M.S. Gorbachev traveled to Reykjavik. A whole package of major, far-reaching, and interrelated measures, which, if adopted, would open up a new era in mankind's life -- the nonnuclear era -- was placed on the negotiating table. The package was based on our program for nuclear disarmament by the year 2000.

The proposals were so radical that, as Washington officials frankly admit, the U.S. delegation at the Reykjavik meeting was simply amazed: Apparently they had not expected the Soviet Union to go so far. Indeed, in putting forward these proposals the USSR took a broad and very bold step. But the step was based on a sober, realistic analysis of the present world situation, on an objective appraisal of where mankind would go and where it would end up unless nuclear weapons, terrestrial and those planned for insertion into space, were eliminated. For good.

We have every right to expect a reasonable reply from the United States: The proposals put forward by the Soviet side took account of Washington's wishes. By making concessions we demonstrated to the world and to the U.S. public how essential it is now to have a new mental approach, one that corresponds to the nuclear era, that gives rise to original ideas which aim not at quick, one-sided gains but at indubitable advantages for all.

Our proposals are based on the principles of equality and identical security and scrupulous consideration of the interests of both countries, their allies, and the peoples of all states.

Hence the broad support in the world for the Soviet side's position. The meeting of Warsaw Pact states' foreign ministers expressed a high opinion of the course defended by M.S. Gorbachev in the difficult and dramatic debate about the destiny of peace. As the world congress of peace-loving forces, which ended in Copenhagen the other day, confirmed, our proposals, our demands are not only in harmony with but coincide completely with the hopes and aspirations of all for whom the destiny of peace if precious.

The U.S. delegation clearly had other ideas. Although Washington is still insisting that the President went to Reykjavik fully laden, this insistence is no more than an attempt to whitewash itself in the eyes of world and U.S. public opinion, an attempt to create the impression that the lack of binding accords was the Soviet Union's "fault," that it was due to Soviet "intractability." If the package of very serious proposals -- by nature compromise proposals, moreover -- are evidence of intractability, then how would one describe the position of the United States, which did not bring to Reykjavik a single new idea, a single new approach, and which failed to bring a single idea containing even a hint of a solution, of any progress at all?

Had not the White House programmed a fruitless meeting in advance? If so, then why, in whose interests?

In the interests of ordinary Americans? Scarcely: Americans, like all other people in the world, are tired of constantly living next to mountains of weapons, tired of fearing for their future, for the future of their offspring. But, evidently, those for whom weapons mean not millions and not even billions of dollars are not tired. It is estimated that the "Star Wars" program will cost at least several trillion dollars. If thousand-dollar bills were placed one on top of another, the "pillar of money" made up of one trillion dollars would rise to a height of nearly 100 km. The profit from "exclusively nuclear" weapons seems pathetic compared with what the "Star Wars" program promises for the military-industrial complex. Is this not one answer to the question why the U.S. delegation refused to make serious moves on the question of SDI?

It was not the only factor, of course. There was also Washington's unwillingness to display a new mental approach, to recognize that in the nuclear missile era it is a complete illusion to expect to achieve military superiority and ensure potential "personal survival" in a conflict, even if the most up-to-date scientific and technical developments, including space weapon developments, are used to that end. There was also an element of clinging desperately to the totally bankrupt thesis that peace and disarmament are possible from a position of strength.

An opportunity was missed in Reykjavik. SDI got in the way of halting the arms race and was the chief obstacle to a nuclear-free world. But the opportunity remains. Since Reykjavik, when the world was literally a step away from what would have been historic decisions, the situation has undergone qualitative changes.

The USSR's program of new proposals opens rather than closes the door to the quest for mutually acceptable solutions. And the Soviet Union is fully resolved to achieve them by continuing contacts and talks on the entire range of questions pertaining to nuclear and space weapons on the basis of the platform we put forward in Reykjavik.

Reykjavik demonstrated that the elimination of the nuclear threat is a realistic possibility. Accords can be reached. The Soviet Union's proposals still stand. All that is needed is the political will, the conviction that mankind will win if the military complex loses.

FURTHER ON GORBACHEV 12 OCT NEWS CONFERENCE

Correction to Television Version

The following correction pertains to the item headlined "Gorbachev Addresses News Conference on Outcome," subheaded "Television Version," published in the 14 October Soviet Union DAILY REPORT on page DD 26:

Page DD 33, after paragraph seven, add: ...an impressive reality.

But the world is also a reality, and now it is impossible not only to earn authority but above all to resolve problems in the world, if one does not take into account the realities of the present day world.

And, well, we sensed, at this meeting, the lack of a new way of thinking. Once again this specter appeared; of the pursuit of military superiority.

During the summer I met with Mr Nixon and, in a conversation, he said to me at that time: I have reason, based on my enormous political and life-long experience to say that this pursuit of this specter has taken us far out of our way, and now we do not know how to get out of these obstructions which consist of the accumulated mountains of nuclear weapons and so forth, and all of this complicates and poisons the situation in the world.

I think, nevertheless, that everything that has taken place -- and after all, accords have taken place, the only thing is that it did not prove possible to formulate them because we posed and brought this question and our proposals in a package. I think that you understand why this was done. Nevertheless, the very path which we have traveled to such major accords about major reductions of nuclear weapons is in itself a great experience which we have acquired here. The gains we have acquired here, in Iceland, in Reykjavik, are enormous.

I think that it is necessary for the President of the United States and for us to consider further the whole situation which has ultimately arisen here at the meeting, and to come back again and attempt to step across the divide between us.

We have already reached accord on much, we have come a long way. It is possible that the President needs to consult Congress, political circles, and the American public. Let America consider. We shall wait, and not retract the proposals which we have announced. In essence we have reached accord on them. That is the first thing.

Second, I believe that all realistic forces in the world should now act. All of us, living in the socialist world, the capitalist world, and the developing world, all of us have a unique opportunity now to finally set about ending the arms race, banning nuclear weapons, destroying them, and removing the nuclear threat from mankind. In this connection we presented the following proposal for the President: To sit down straight away and reach accord that, immediately after our meeting in Reykjavik, full-scale negotiations be initiated on banning nuclear explosions.

Furthermore, we made the proposal in this way: This will be a process during which we could consider at some stage, perhaps even as a matter of prime concern, the question of thresholds, of the power of nuclear explosions, the number of nuclear explosions per year, and the fate of the treaties of 1974 and 1976, and we would proceed toward the drafting of a full-scale treaty on a total and final ban on nuclear explosions. I can tell you that we were close to finding a formula on this matter too, because after all, here, too, everything is logical. Incidentally, we said to the U.S. side: We are not demanding a moratorium from you; that's your affair. You answer to your Congress and your people; whether you continue your explosions, when we start our negotiations, or join our moratorium, is your affair; but let us begin sitting down to full-scale talks to draft an agreement on a total and final ban on nuclear explosions. Along the way we shall also consider the questions you speak of, that of verification, thresholds, and the number of nuclear explosions, and the 1974 and 1976 treaties. All that can be considered.

We were moving closer together, but when the breakdown came over antimissile defense, all discussion was broken off, and the whole quest came to a halt, and we ended our meeting.

I think now.... (supplying dropped paragraphs)

PRAVDA Second Edition Version

PM201321 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 14 Oct 86 Second Edition pp 1, 2

[TASS report: "M.S. Gorbachev's Press Conference" -- capitalized passages printed in boldface]

[Text] M.S. Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, gave a press conference in Reykjavik on 12 October for the journalists covering the Soviet-U.S. meeting.

Addressing the representatives of mass news media, M.S. Gorbachev declared:

Good evening, ladies and gentlemen, comrades! I greet you all.

About an hour has passed since our meeting with U.S. President Mr Reagan ended. It went on for slightly longer than we had planned. This was necessitated by the work in hand. I would like to apologize to you for not arriving for the press conference at the scheduled time.

You already know that the meeting was held on the initiative of the Soviet leadership. Naturally, however, there would have been no meeting had there been no agreement on Mr Reagan's part. I would, therefore, say that it was our joint decision to hold the meeting in Reykjavik.

Now the meeting has ended. It is said at times that a face is blurred seen from close up [reference to quotation from poet Sergey Yesenin, used figuratively to mean that the importance of an event can be assessed only when it has become part of the past]. I have only just emerged from the meeting which, especially at its last stage, took the form of heated discussions. I am still in the grip of impressions from these discussions. Nonetheless, I will attempt right away not only to share my impressions with you but also to work out what actually happened. Even so, these will be initial impressions, initial assessments, an initial analysis. The entire meeting will still have to be evaluated substantively.

A major meeting took place, and you will appreciate this when I describe its contents and the problems which were the subject of very broad, very intensive, and very keen discussion at the meeting.

The atmosphere at the meeting was friendly. We had an opportunity to express our opinions freely and without restrictions. This enabled us to gain a deeper understanding on many major problems of world politics and bilateral relations, and primarily on problems which are at the focus of the entire world public's attention, on questions of war and peace and ending the nuclear arms race -- in short, on the entire package of questions contained within this subject.

I regularly read the world press and, over the past few days I saw what a broad response was generated by the news that it [the meeting] was being held. Much was said in this regard about the general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee and about the U.S. President; there were questions whether they were not rather in a hurry, whether there was a need for such a meeting, who made concessions to whom, who outdid whom, and so on and so forth. [paragraph continues]

But you know, the reason which provided the starting point for our proposal to the U.S. President to meet without delay and for his decision to respond positively to this invitation is highly significant.

Now, I would like to turn back to Geneva, when we met for the first time. That was a major dialogue and now, after the passage of quite some time, this still remains our assessment of the Geneva meeting.

At that time, if you recall, we recognized the special responsibility borne by the USSR and the United States for the preservation of peace, and we jointly declared that a nuclear war must never be fought and that there can be no victors in it. This is an admission of vast importance. We also declared that neither side would pursue military superiority. This is also a very important conclusion.

Almost a year has passed since Geneva. The Soviet leadership has remained loyal to the pledges it gave there. Having returned from Geneva, we extended our moratorium: It was to have been in force in our country until 1 January this year. Silence has reigned on our testing ranges for 14 months -- is this not evidence of our commitment to the Geneva accords and our responsibility for the fate of peace? Even so, these were not easy decisions to make, bearing in mind that the explosions in Nevada went on, and are taking place also now. On 15 January we made a major statement substantiating a program for the elimination of nuclear weapons by the end of this century.

Last June the Warsaw Pact states submitted a major comprehensive program for large-scale reductions of conventional armaments and armed forces in Europe. This is also a major step, taking into account the anxieties expressed by West Europeans and the United States.

Drawing lessons from the Chernobly tragedy, we put forward the initiative to hold a special session of the IAEA General Conference in Vienna. It did take place, and you know its results -- they are extremely promising. Now we have an international machinery making it possible to solve many of the most important questions of the safety of nuclear power engineering.

In other words, during the past period -- and I think that I would not exaggerate by thus assessing our policy, because I speak of facts and not just of intentions -- we have done everything to help shape a new thinking in the nuclear age. We note with gratification that the shoots of this new thinking are springing up, especially in the European field. In particular, this was displayed by the success of the Stockholm conference.

Maybe I will end with this the list of specific actions which we undertook, guided by the spirit and letter of the accords with President Reagan in Geneva. I think that the facts themselves will enable you to appraise the seriousness of our attitude toward them.

Still, why was the meeting in Reykjavik necessary, what were the motives behind this initiative of ours?

The point is that the hopes of major changes in the world situation, hopes which sprung in all of us, started fading soon after the meeting in Geneva. And not without reason, I think. Very much, maybe even too much, was said at the Soviet-U.S. talks; there were, as I told the President yesterday, 50 to 100 options of all kinds of proposals. This alone already gives rise to doubts about the fruitfulness of the discussions taking place there. [paragraph continues]

Had there been one or two, even three options, which would have made possible to somewhat narrow the discussion and concentrate the quest in some important directions, it could have been expected that the quest would have ended by coming to some specific agreements and proposals to the governments. But nothing of the sort is happening in Geneva, even though the main questions of world politics are being discussed there.

Lately these talks, to put it simply, have been idling and have come to a virtual standstill. The arms race has not been halted, and matters are increasingly obviously approaching a point beyond which a new spiral of this race with unpredictable consequences -- both political and military -- becomes inevitable.

Our major initiatives, of which I spoke earlier, have generated a broad response among the world public. But they have not encountered the requisite understanding from the U.S. Administration.

The situation has deteriorated, alarm has started growing again in the world. I think that I am not exaggerating -- even you yourselves are witnesses to this: The world is in turmoil. The world is in turmoil and it demands of the leaders of all countries, first and foremost of the great powers and primarily the Soviet Union and the United States, political will and determination capable of halting the dangerous trends.

And so, something had to be done to overcome this course of events. We drew the conclusion: A new impetus is needed, a powerful impetus, in order to turn the process in the necessary direction. Such an impetus could be given only by the leaders of the USSR and the United States. This was precisely why, replying to President Reagan's 25 July letter, I decided to invite him to an immediate meeting. I wrote: The situation is such that we must put all business aside for a day or two and hold a meeting without delay.

This letter was handed to the President by Comrade Shevardnadze.

And so, now this exceptionally important meeting has taken place. We assumed that much would depend on its outcome. Of course, we did not come to the meeting empty-handed.

What did we bring to Reykjavik? We brought an entire package of major proposals which, were they to be adopted, could really bring within a short time, I would say, a breakthrough in all directions of the struggle to limit nuclear weapons and to really avert the threat of nuclear war, they would make it possible to start moving toward a nuclear-free world.

I proposed to the President that we give right here, in Reykjavik, instructions to our foreign ministers and other appropriate departments to prepare three draft agreements which the President and I could later sign during my visit to the United States.

THE FIRST -- ON STRATEGIC WEAPONS -- to reduce them by at least 50 percent. With a view, moreover, to completely eliminating those deadliest of weapons already by the end of this century. We proceeded from the premise that the world expects really major steps, profound reductions, and not some kind of cosmetic steps merely to pacify public opinion for a limited period. The time has come when there is real need for bold and responsible actions in the interests of the whole world, including the peoples of the Soviet Union and the United States.

Of course, the Soviet and U.S. delegations which would have been instructed to prepare the draft agreement on strategic weapons would have had to balance properly and honestly a reduction in their historically established structure. We are talking about the triad recognized way back during the elaboration of SALT II. But when we started discussing this question with the President, we again received in reply everything that has figured at the Geneva talks -- all the same levels and sublevels, a lot of arithmetic, to put it briefly, and everything in order to confuse the essence of the question. At that point we introduced the following clarification -- to cut by half each part of strategic offensive weapons: ground-based strategic missiles, submarine-based strategic missiles, and strategic bombers.

The U.S. delegation agreed to that. Thus, we reached accord on a very major issue.

Let me, moreover, draw your attention to the fact that here we made serious concessions. You evidently remember that when we put forward the proposal on 50-percent reductions in Geneva we also included medium-range missiles in the numbers of strategic weapons, because they could reach our territory. Now we gave up this demand, and we also deleted from the agenda the question of forward-based means.,

And so, thanks to these major concessions, there was agreement in Reykjavik on strategic arms reductions.

OUR SECOND PROPOSAL CONCERNED MEDIUM-RANGE WEAPONS. We proposed that instructions be given to prepare an accord also on this type of weapon, having in mind a rejection of all hitherto discussed options -- interim, temporary, and so on -- and a return to the former U.S. option, in other words -- to completely destroy U.S. and Soviet medium-range missiles in Europe. Moreover, in contrast with our Geneva proposals, we now left completely aside the French and British nuclear potentials. Even though, you understand, this was a great concession on our part. After all, these two countries are allies of the United States and posess a nuclear potential which is continually being built up and improved. Their entire military activity is closely coordinated within the NATO frameword. We are perfectly well aware of this. Nonetheless, we eliminated this obstacle to accord.

To go on, there was concern regarding Asia. Here we also offered a compromise: Let us get down to talks right away, sort out complaints, and find a solution. We understood that the question of missiles with a range of less than 1,000 km would inevitably arise. We also submitted a proposal on this question: Let us freeze these missiles and embark on talks about their fate.

There you have the major measures which we wanted to see [khoteli poyti]. It seems to me that the Americans did not expect this from us, but they engaged in discussion and frankly declared that this did not suit them -- to withdraw their missiles from Europe. They started inviting us again to the interim option. But we insisted on Europe's complete liberation from Soviet and U.S. medium-range missiles.

In the course of the discussion on this question we drew the U.S. President's attention to the fact that he was, to all appearances, renouncing his brainchild -- the "zero option," which he persistently offered in the past, and now he was being met halfway.

The discussion continued right until today, a sharp discussion, and we decided to take yet another constructive step: [paragraph continues]

We declared that given the implementation of U.S. and Soviet medium-range missiles in Europe we agree to leave 100 warheads on our medium-range missiles in Asia, and the Americans -- and equal number of their same missiles on U.S. territory. Finally we reached agreement also on this type of nuclear weapon even though, as I already said, our major concession was also helpful here.

Movement must begin. I have said this repeatedly. Bold and original solutions are needed! If we were always to turn to the past for advice, to use what applies to completely different times, not giving any attention to where we are today and where we will be tomorrow, and that there may not be any tomorrow at all, if we were at act in this fashion there would be no dialogue at all. Is it not necessary to make a start somewhere? We offered [posli na] this step even though, I repeat, this is not easy for us.

AS REGARDS THE READINESS TO OFFER [poyti na] DEEP CUTS IN NUCLEAR WEAPONS, WE FORMULATED THE QUESTION AS FOLLOWS: SINCE WE ARE ENTERING A SPECIFIC STAGE IN THE ELIMINATION OF NUCLEAR WEAPONS, THERE MUST BE ABSOLUTE CLARITY AS REGARDS VERIFICATION [kontrol]. Verification [kontrol] must be more rigorous. The Soviet Union advocates triple verification [kontrol] which would ensure each side's complete confidence that it would not fall into a trap, a snare. We confirmed our readiness for any forms of verification [kontrol]. In view of this stance of ours, this question was also taken off the agenda.

The following is another problem linked with the fact that we are embarking on practical elimination of nuclear weapons: Each side must have guarantees that during this period neither one of them will start seeking military superiority. In my view, this is a perfectly fair, legitimate formulation of the question -- both from a political and a military viewpoint.

From the political viewpoint: If we were to start a reduction, then show concern to ensure that all the brakes which are now in effect and stand in the way of the creation [sozdaniye] of new types of weapons are not only preserved but also reinforced.

From the military viewpoint: Concern must really be shown to ensure that, while the process of reduction is going on, one on the sides does not secretly prepare, capture the initiative, and attain military superiority. This is impermissible. That goes for the Soviet Union, too. But we are entitled to make exactly the same demand of the U.S. side.

This is why we formulated the question as follows: In a situation when we are entering a stage of real and deep reductions, when a 10-year period -- and this is how this entire situation appeared to us at the meeting -- would see the elimination of the nuclear potential of the Soviet Union and the United States, it is necessary not only to dismantle the mechanisms constraining the arms race, but also to strengthen them, and primarily such a mechanism as the ABM [Treaty]. Our proposal boiled down to the folowing: We would strengthen the ABM Treaty of unlimited duration with an identical pledge by the two sides that they would not take advantage of the right to withdraw from the treaty over these 10 years. These will be precisely the 10 years when the nuclear potential's reduction would be taking place.

A correct, logical formulation? Logical. Serious? Serious. Does it accord with the interests of both sides? Yes, it does. We emphasized in our proposal that during the 10 years all the ABM [Treaty] demands would be rigorously observed, that only research and tests within the laboratory framework would be allowed.

What did we want to say by this? We know the commitment of the U.S. Administration and the President to SDI. Our agreement to the continuation of laboratory tests would have given the President an opportunity to see through [do kontsa dovesti] his idea and to clarify [vyyansnit] what SDI actually is. Even though, I must say, it is already clear to many people and to us what it really is.

It was right at that point that a real duel began between the two approaches in world politics toward questions like the termination of the arms race and the banning of nuclear weapons. The President insisted right through the end that America should have the right to research and test everything concerning SDI not only in laboratories but also outside them, including in outer space. But who could agree to that?

So it turned out: We were on the brink of making major historic decisions, because all previous documents so far -- ABM, SALT I, SALT II -- talked only about arms limitations, while now [the talk was about] significant reduction. Insofar as the U.S. Administration, confident in its technological advantage, is striving, as we now convinced ourselves once more, to break through to military superiority via SDI, it attempted [poshal na] to bury the almost-reached accords which we had already agreed [soglasovali]. The only thing left to do was to give instructions to elaborate treaties and procedure --how to implement them practically. All this could have been signed in Washington during my visit.

I told the President: We are missing a historic chance. Our positions have never before been so close. On parting, the President told me that he was disappointed and that I, he said, had come unwilling to sign an agreement, an accord. Why, he said, are you, because of just one word, showing such rigidity of approach toward SDI and the tests problem? I replied: The point is not the word but the essence.

The U.S. Administration's approach toward SDI is the key to understanding what it has in mind. It has in mind what the U.S. military-industrial complex has in mind. The administration is in its power, and the President is not free to make such a decision.

We accomplished breakthroughs, resumed discussions, and I saw that the President was getting no support. This is why the meeting failed, why accord failed, at a point when we were already close to achieving a historic outcome. This was the dramatic situation which developed at the Reykjavik meeting at the point when, despite the highly significant concessions on our part, we failed to reach agreement.

Even though our dialogue with the United States has been difficult in the past, it did continue after Geneva. I told the President my view of what our meeting during my visit to the United States ought to be. This view is not a condition, but an appreciation of our responsibility, both mine and the President's. Responsibility dictates that the future meeting in Washington must be approached in precisely this way.

What is needed is a fruitful meeting. It must really lead to tangible results and radical changes, especially on such a burning issue as nuclear arms control, ending the arms race, and eliminating nuclear weapons. I have written to the President in letters and I said at our meeting: You and I, Mr President, must not allow our meeting in Washington to fail. This is why I suggested that we meet without any delay, and this is what happened here in Reykjavik. We have something constructive in contribute and seek agreement on in Wasington, serious proposals, serious draft solutions.

I cannot let myself even think -- not for one minute -- that the meeting in Washington may fail. What, generally speaking, ought people to think then -- in the Soviet Union, in the United States, and all over the world. What kind of politicians head two such vast states, with which the fate of the entire world is linked to a considerable extent? They meet, exchange correspondence, this is already their third meeting, and they cannot agree on a single thing! I consider that such an outcome would be simply scandalous, with unpredictable consequences.

We cannot let this happen. It would generate disappointment all over the world, not just in our countries. This, in fact, is the intention behind the Washington meeting, what kind of meeting it must be and with what results. This was the understanding that prompted us, I repeat, to take the initiative of holding a working meeting here, in Iceland, in Reykjavik, so that we can sort everything out in a businesslike fashion, carefully listen to one another, and try to find points of contact and joint approaches which would accord with the interests of our two countries,the interests of our allies and the peoples of all countries.

Yet the Americans arrived here empty-handed, with the mothballed package from which the Geneva talks are already suffocating. In order to break out of the prevailing situation, lead the process talks to a new stage, and really solve questions, we made the proposals which I have already described to you. You also know now what actually happened.

So, what is to be done in the future? The United States remains a reality, and what a reality; the Soviet Union also remains an impressive reality. You may know that the hero of one of our Russian writers intended to "close down" America. We do not suffer from such a complex. America is a reality. But not only the USSR and the United States -- the whole contemporary world is a reality. Now it is impossible not only to gain prestige but, and this is the main point, to solve problems without taking into account this reality of today's world.

If there was one thing that we did feel at this meeting, it was the shortage of new thinking. Once again we were faced with the specter of the pursuit of military superiority. Last summer I met with Mr Nixon, and he told me then: On the basis of my vast experience in life and politics,Ihave the right to draw the conclusion that the pursuit of this specter has taken us far. Now we do not know how to find our way out of the obstacles created by the stockpiled mountains of nuclear weapons. All this complicates and poisons the situation in the world.

I nevertheless think that everything that took place here -- and after all, there were almost ready accords, we only failed to formulate them -- is highly significant. We submitted our proposals as a package. I think that you understand why this was done. The actual path which we traveled here, in Iceland, the path to such major accords on such significant reductions of nuclear arms -- this is already an enormous experience that has been gained here, these are enormous gains.

I think that both the U.S. President and we must still think over the entire situation which ultimately developed here at the eeting, turn once more to the questions that were discussed, and attempt to bridge what separates us. After all, we have already reached accord on many points, we have gone through a great deal. It is possible that the President must consult with Congress, with political circles, and with the U.S. public.

Let America think it over. We will wait, without withdrawing our proposals which we have published, and we have essentially offered to reach accord on them. This is first.

Second, I think that all realistic forces in the world must act now. All people living on earth -- in the socialist world, in the capitalist world, in the developing world -- now have a unique chance to finally embark in reality on terminating the arms race, destroying it, and averting the nuclear threat from mankind. This was the task to which our proposal to the President was subordinated: Let us reach accord that, immediately following the conclusion of te Reykjavik meeting, our representatives sit down for talks on banning nuclear explosions. Moreover, we were flexible in our approach, we declared that we perceive this as a process during which it would be possible to also examine at some stage, maybe even on a priority basis, the question of "thresholds" of nuclear explosion yields, and the question of the annual number of nuclear explosions, and the fate of the 1974-1976 treaties, thus approaching the elaboration of a full-scale treaty on the complete and final ban of nuclear explosions.

We were close to finding a formula on this question, too. Incidentally, we said at the meeting: We do not demand a moratorium of you. That is up to you. You are accountable to your Congress, to your people, as to whether, following the start of talks, you will continue to explode or will join our moratorium. That is up to you. But let us sit down for full-scale talks to elaborate an agreement on the complete and final banning of nuclear explosions.

Thus, we also draw closer on this point. But when the rupture on SDI occurred, the entire discussion came to a halt and all quest ceased. We terminated our meeting.

I think that we and the Americans must now think over everything, and also world public opinon must think over the prevailing situation on the main question perturbing the peoples of all countries -- the question of war and peace, of the nuclear threat. I do not think I am exaggerating in thinking that everything we offered to the President meets the interests of the U.S. people and the peoples of all countries. If anyone does not think so, then let him heed the demands of the U.S. people,the Soviet people, and all people.

Having come here to the meeting, I said that the time for actions had come. Indeed, this is the time for actions and we must not waste it. We will act. We will not deviate from our line of peace and struggle against the arms race, for banning and liquidating nuclear weapons, for averting the threat from the entire globe. I am convinced that we are not alone in this struggle.

This is what I would like to say to you now, right after the conclusion of the meeting. Obviously I could have said more, had I had more time to think over everything that occurred. But it seems to me that I expresed myself completely clearly and definitely on all questions.

During the conversations with the President we also touched on many other questions. We spoke on humanitarian questions, and imediately encountered specific problems. Two groups of experts were at work. You probably know this. One of them was headed on our side by Marshal of the Soviet Union Akhromeyev, chief of General Staff, and on the U.S. side by Paul Nitze. They worked virtually through the night.

The group on humanitarian questions was headed on our side by Deputy Foreign Minister Bessmertnykh, and on the U.S. side by Assistant Secretary of State Mrs Ridgway.

An interesting exchange of opinions also took place there. The certain amount of mutual understanding which occurred there could have become a component of a final document. But since the main component collapsed, the entire process was halted.

As you see, generally speaking the meeting was interesting, important, and highly promising. But, for the time being, it ended in this fashion.

Let us not despair. I think that the meeting has brought us to a very important stage, the stage of understanding where we are. It showed that accords are possible. I am convinced of this.

Thank you for your attention.

Do you really still have questions even after my so detailed speech? Fire away. We will sit here until dawn.

Question (Czechoslovak television): Mikhail Sergeyevich, you have said that a historic chance has been missed here, in Reykjavik. When, in your opinion, might a new chance arise?

Answer: You know, I would give an optimistic answer to this. Because much has already been done both on the eve of the meeting and at the meeting itself. If -- both in the United States, at the White House, and in our Soviet leadership -- we think everything over again from realistic positions and display responsibility, then the possibility of solving the questions already raised has not yet been lost.

Question (Japanese NHK TV company): Does this mean that the dialogue with the United States, with the Reagan administration is still continuing? Or do you think that there is very little opportunity left for a productive dialogue with Reagan?

Answer: I think that the need for a dialogue, however difficult it might be, has now increased still more.

Question (PRAVDA): Mikhail Sergeyevich, what do you think? Why, for all that, did the American Administration undertake to wreck the talks by making such an irresponsible decision and ignoring world public opinion?

Answer: In my opinion, America still has to determine its position. It seems to have not yet done so. This, so we felt, affected the President's standpoint.

Question (Australian Broadcasting Corporation): You have said that President Reagan is a captive of the military-industrial complex. Does this mean that the next 2 years will be fruitless? Do you have any hope that the next U.S. president will not be a captive of that complex?

Answer: Despite what the military-industrial complex is now and despite the weight it carries in America today, let us not overestimate its potential. The decisive word in any country belongs to the people, including the American people.

Question (Icelandic radio and television): Following the negative result of the meeting, will the Soviet Union try to counter the American SDI program with anything, and will it launch its space arms program at full power?

Answer: I think you have understood the purport of the Soviet position. If we have now approached the stage where we are beginning a deep reduction of nuclear weapons -- both strategic weapons and medium missiles -- and we were already arriving at an accord with the Americans to do this over 10 years, we have a right to demand to be guaranteed that nothing unexpected or unforeseen will happen during this period. This also includes such a sphere as ABM defense, and particularly its space echelon.

I told the President that SDI does not bother us in the military respect. In my opinion, few people even in America now believe that such a system can be created. Moreover, if America eventually decides to do this, our reply will not be symmetrical. Indeed, I told the President: You know that I have already been made your colleague in SDI. He was surprised. It turns out -- I said -- in connection with the fact that I am so sharply critical of SDI, and this gives you a most convincing argument that SDI is needed. You simply say: Since Gorbachev is against it, this means it is a good thing. You pick up applause and finance. True, cynics and skeptics have emerged who say: But suppose this is a crafty scheme by Gorbachev not to get involved in SDI himself but to ruin America. So, let them figure it out themselves. In any case, SDI does not frighten us. I confidently state this because it is an irresponsible thing to engage in bluffing on such issues. There will be an answer to SDI. Asymmetrical, but there will be one. At the same time, we will not have to sacrifice much.

But where does its danger lie? First, there is the political danger. A situation is at once created which introduces uncertainty and fans mistrust of one another and suspicion. And then there is no likelihood of reductions in nuclear weapons. In short, to thoroughly tackle the reduction of nuclear weapons quite a different situation is needed. Second, there is still the military aspect. Through SDI it is possible to arrive at new kinds of weapons. We can also state this competently. And arrive at a totally new stage of the arms race, with very serious consequences.

It turns out that, on the one hand, we reach agreement to begin reducing nuclear weapons, which today are the most dangerous and terrible weapons. But, on the other hand, we are to bless research and even carry it out in space, in order to create the latest weapons. This runs counter to normal logic.

Question (THE WASHINGTON POST): You have just held another 2-day meeting with President Reagan. What impression did you gain of the President as a politician? Do you believe that he shares your sense of responsibility for the destiny of the world?

Answer: I gained the impression that Mr Reagan and I can continue the dialogue and engage in a search for solutions to major, urgent problems, including those of which I have spoken.

Question (Danish television): With regard to the unsatisfactory results of this meeting, does this mean that there will be no progress on the question of banning nuclear tests and on other questions discussed yesterday and today? Is a nuclear test ban linked with other questions that were examined in your talks?

Answer: I have already answered this question. We believe that this does not cut short either our contacts with the Americans and the President or, still less, international relations. The search continues and will continue. And what has happened here in Iceland must make everyone feel all the more that it is necessary to join in the common struggle to normalize the international situation and to seek ways out of dead-end situations, including those discussed here in Reykjavik. In fact, one of the dead ends arose here, too. But I am an optimist.

Question (GDR television): You have said that the meeting did not produce results. Does this mean that it was useless? Do you believe that peace has become more reliable after the Reykjavik meeting?

Answer: I think you have thought out your question well. I always like the precision of our German friends' expressions, including their thoughts. It is, of course, sad and disappointing that we have completed the meeting without reaching agreement on questions to which we seemed to have found approaches. Despite this, I would not call the meeting useless. On the contrary, it is a step in a complex and difficult dialogue in search of solutions. For, in general, we are seeking difficult solutions to difficult questions. Therefore, let us not sow panic through the world. At the same time, the world must know everything that is happening and not feel that it is a detached observer. The time has now come for vigorous actions by all forces.

Question (American ABC TV company): Mr General Secretary, I do not understand why, when you and President Reagan had an opportunity to reach an agreement on nuclear arms reduction, the Soviet side did not consent to SDI research. For you yourself said in Geneva in the past that you are ready to pay a big price for reducing nuclear arms. And now, when such opportunities existed, you missed them.

Answer: Your question already contains an element of criticism, so I will answer it in detail.

First, the U.S. President came empty-handed to Reykjavik. The American delegation, I would say, brought us trash from the Geneva talks. And it was only thanks to the Soviet side's far-reaching proposals that we were able to get close to very major accords (mind you, they were not formalized) on reducing strategic offensive arms and on medium missiles. Naturally, we hoped that under these conditions -- and I think this is perfectly clear to a politican, a military person, and simply to a normal person -- if we sign such major accords, it is necessary to ensure that nothing happens to wreck this difficult process, toward which we have been working for decades. I have already said what we have in mind. I will add: The American side has long been undermining ABM. It has already cast doubt on SALT II, and it would now like in Reykjavik to organize the funeral of ABM, and to do so with the participation of the Soviet Union and Gorbachev. That will not come off. The whole world would not understand us. And I am convinced of this.

If we also start attacking ABM -- the last mechanism that has done so much, for all that, to curb the arms race process -- then we are worth nothing as politicians. But it is not enough to preserve it when deep nuclear arms reductions begin, it must be strengthened. [paragraph continues]

And we have proposed a strengthening mechanism: not to use for the 10 years during which we will reduce completely and destroy the nuclear potential in our countries -- not to use the right to pull out of ABM.

At the same time, so that no one seeks -- neither the Soviet Union to overtake America in space research and forge ahead or to achieve military superiority, nor America with regard to the Soviet Union -- we have said that we are for laboratory research and testing but against going into space with this research and testing of parts of space ABM defense. This is our demand. Thus, our demand in this instance was also constructive and took the partner's positions into account. If they agreed to this, the administration would get an opportunity to resolve its questions within the framework of laboratory research, but without attempts to create a space ABM defense. I think there is iron logic here, as children say. It is also necessary to learn from children sometimes.

Now let us let the women have a say.

Question (THE GUARDIAN): Is the Soviet Union planning any new initiatives with regard to West Europe after what has happened in Reykjavik?

Answer: I think West Europe hears what I say, and if it thinks about and studies our proposals carefully, it will see that they accord with West Europe's interests. We are far from indifferent to the interests of West Europe, where the shoots of the new thinking are striking root and where responsibility for preserving and strengthening our common "European home" is growing.

Question (NEWSWEEK): What are your intentions regarding a trip to Washington? You have said that it is necessary first to secure one or two agreements. Is it possible to reach such agreements before you arrive in Washington on a visit?

Answer: I think that, despite all today's dramatics, we have not gotten further away from Washington but closer to it. And if the President and the American administration heed my proposal to continue stydying everything discussed here in Reykjavik and consult those circles and they consider it necessary to consult, I think that not all is lost. There are opportunities, underpinned by what we had here in Reykajavik, to arrive at agreements which would make a meeting in Washington real and possible. And it could produce results.

Question (American CNN TV company): Mr Gorbachev, you said in your speech that President Reagan must think about the situation and consult with Congress, consult with the American people. Do you believe that American public opinion will support the Soviet approach on this plane?

Answer: Let us wait and see.

Question (RUDE PRAVO): I have a question for you as a politician and jurist. What, in your opinion, are the priorities in questions of human rights in the nuclear missile age, and what role can the human factor play in resolving the question of war and peace?

Answer: I see you are a philosopher. I too used to study philosophy, and I have now begun being interested in it again. I think that when we speak of human rights, we must remember that today the question of preserving peace and diverting the nuclear threat from mankind is the top priority. [paragraph continues]

If there is peace, there will be life. And we will sort out the problems somehow. There are more and more educated people and educated peoples in the world. The peoples will sort everything out. Therefore, when we speak of human rights, I would put in the first place the human right to life. That is the first point.

And the second one -- the human factor. In the nuclear age (and I see this precisely as a manifestation of the new thinking) the threat of war poses in a new way also the question of the role of the human factor in the matter of preventing it. Nuclear war will affect everyone, regardless of where it begins. Only ill-wishers believe that all antiwar movements and all who come out in defense of peace are the result of Moscow's intrigues. Today women, children, and men of all ages are rising up, taking each other by the hand, and demanding a halt to the dangerous tendency to slide toward nuclear war. The role of the human factor under these conditions is increasing significantly.

Question (IZVESTIYA): The White House has frequently said a great deal to the effect that Soviet ICBMs pose the chief danger to America. In Reykjavik we proposed eliminating this chief danger to America over 10 years. What is your impression, why did the other side prove not ready to remove this chief danger and divert it from its country?

Answer: You are very right to have raised this question. This argument has been used for many years: The Soviet Union, they say, is not serious about disarmament and ending the arms race since it does not take account of America's concern in this plane.

As you see, we have proposed making radical reductions. And we put the question very pointedly. There is a triad of strategic arms recognized both by us and by the Americans. We have proposed reducing this entire triad of strategic armed forces by 50 percent in the first 5 years. This is a major step.

But, at the same time, we told the Americans that we too have a concern. For in the United States the greater part of the strategic forces is deployed on submarines. That is approximately 700 missiles on which there are almost 6,000 multiple independently targetable reentry vehicles. And the submarines, as is known, cruise in the seas and oceans around the Soviet Union. From where will they make a strike? This is no less dangerous than heavy ground-based missiles.

In short, when they do not want to solve questions, they seek problems and create artificial obstacles. However, here in Reykjavik we have cut the ground from under such invented obstacles. This is what is important. For we took a very big step by dropping, as I have already said, the reservations concerning medium missiles, which for us are strategic weapons. And we have also dropped forward-based means from the reckoning. This is our goodwill. But the Americans, nevertheless, did not meet us halfway.

They think that through space they will achieve military superiority over us and realize the idea of one President who said: He who holds sway in space will hold sway on earth. This shows that we have to deal with imperial ambitions.

But the world today is not what it was before. It does not want to be and will not be the domain either of the United States or of the Soviet Union. Each country has the right to its own choice, its own ideology, its own values. [paragraph continues]

If we do not recognize this, then there are no international relations. Then there is chaos and law of the fist. We will never agree to that.

America is probably very nostalgic for the old times, when it was militarily superior to us -- for we emerged from the war weakened economically.

There is evidently nostalgia for the past in America. Nevertheless, we will wish our American partners to be aware of today's realities. They, too, must do so. Otherwise -- that is, if the Americans do not start thinking in today's terms and proceeding from present realities -- we will not make progress in the search for correct solutions.

Question (Bulgarian television): As I understand it, the Geneva talks are not ending, and the Soviet leadership intends to give the Soviet delegation a mission to seek a solution to the questions which have not yet been resolved?

Answer: You are right.

Question: Do you think that the same instructions will also be given to the American delegation after Reykjavik?

Answer: I hope that this will be precisely so.

Question (CTK news agency): What influence, in your opinion, will the outcome of the Reykjavik meeting have on the all-European process?

Answer: I think that at this very crucial time both the politicians and the peoples of Europe will be equal to it. The times demand actions and not just grandiloquent statements followed by nothing concrete. The world is tired, the world is sick of blather, the world needs real progress: disarmament and the elimination of nuclear weapons. I think that this trend will grow. I hope particularly for the wisdom and responsibility of Europe's politicians and peoples.

Question (American NBC TV company): As I understand it, you are directly calling on other members of the international community to act as a kind of lobby to influence the United States and make it change its opinion?

Answer: We know how developed lobbyism is in your country and how the political process goes in America. Perhaps that was why it was difficult for the President to make a decision at this meeting. But when it is a question of strengthening peace and taking real steps to that end, when joint efforts are needed, this concerns everyone and not just the United States and the Soviet Union, so it is necessary to speak not of lobbyism but of a sense of responsibility, of the peoples' common sense, of understanding of the asset of peace, and the need to safeguard it. Therefore, it is insulting to accuse peoples or movements advocating peace of being lobbyists in favor of the Soviet Union. It is a question of people taking a political and civic stance.

Question (the Icelandic newspaper MORGUNBLADID): I work as a newspaper publisher in Iceland. Did the decision to come to Reykjavik pose any difficulties for you? With Iceland a NATO member? At the same time, as is know, our government has advocated declaring the north a nuclear-free zone, and I would like to know your attitude to this.

Answer: I would like to end on this topic, and I will gladly take advantage of the question put by a representative of Iceland's press. I wish to remind you that it was we who suggested Iceland as a possible place to meet. Therefore, we had no difficulties on that score.

I wish to thank the Government and people of Iceland for using their potential -- human, organizational, and material -- to help in organizing this important meeting. We are grateful for this, and we felt good here. I have gained a lot that is interesting from information from Raisa Maksimovna, who had many meetings with Icelanders. All these contacts were very interesting. The friendly atmosphere and the great interest in our country are gratifying. We are grateful to Iceland and the Icelandic Government for what they have done. We wish your people prosperity.

As for the last part of your question with regard to the fact that the Government of Iceland wants to declare the north a nuclear-free zone, we welcome that.

Dear friends, I thank you for your attention. I think you and I have spent our time usefully. I wish you all the best.

BURLATSKIY 'OPEN LETTER' TO PERLE ON REYKJAVIK

PM211515 Moscow LITERATURNAYA GAZETA in Russian 22 Oct 86 p 14

[F. Burlatskiy "Open Letter to Mr Richard Perle, Whom I Had the Pleasure of Meeting at the U.S. Press Center in Reykjavik": "What Does America Want?"]

[Text] Sir!

I have decided to address this letter to you personally for two reasons. First -- I noticed you while I was at the U.S. Press Center in Reykjavik during one of the regular briefings. That was at a point when poor Mr Matlock and his colleagues were wriggling beneath the hail of merciless questions from merciless U.S. and European journalists. Suddenly, looking behind me, I saw a man standing modestly at the very end of the hall, leaning his shoulder against the door frame, hands crossed on his chest, and now and again smiling a charming but typically American, toothy smile. I asked one of my colleagues who he was, and was amazed to hear his answer: "Richard Perle." Mr Weinberger's famous assistant secretary of defense! Right then, looking at you, I thought to myself: "There he stands, the real man of business. Why should he submit himself to trials on the rostrum when the strings moving the puppets are in any case in his hands?" I was introduced to you. You favored me with the very same smile, and thus I gained the moral right to discuss the results of Reykjavik with you now.

Second -- I wanted to congratulate you personally on the success because you, and I am deeply convinced of this, are one of the few people in Reykjavik who felt a real sense of gratification with the zero result from the meeting between the leaders of the two nuclear giants in the contemporary world.

I imagine that, for you personally, this may have been the zenith of your entire life. Other advisers of the U.S. Presidents, who were inclined toward reaching various accords with us, are in disgrace. One American told me that the President himself had tears in his eyes when, after the last session, he came out of the house where the talks were being held. [paragraph continues]

I would like to believe that this was really so, although another American remarked that this was contrived for television. But confess, Mr Perle -- after all, you are an honest person, one of the few who bluntly and openly oppose any disarmament accords -- are you celebrating a victory? Is it a lie that you feel as if you have ridden back to the Pentagon on a white charger?

I am prepared to believe you, Mr Perle: Maybe you would not be against a reduction of some, mainly obsolete types of U.S. nuclear missile weapons in exchange for a radical reduction of our ICBM's. But if I understand your position correctly, you are totally unwilling to support any restrictions on arms upgrading, let alone on the SDI program. Or is that not so?

Furthermore, I am convinced that you are celebrating also for another reason -- the tactics governing talks with us. I can almost hear you now, repeating at sessions in the White House, in Congress, in the Pentagon, and in the Department of State: You see, we were right! You can talk with the Russians only from a position of strength. This is the only language they understand! It is necessary to pressure more, to be more offensive, to spend even more on the SDI program, to bomb Libya a few more times, and then the "Russian bear" that used to frighten us in the past will come begging to us of his own accord. I was even told about the existence of some report, compiled by some Sovietologist for the U.S. leadership, which proves that, in the event that the present pace of military competition is stepped up, the Soviet economy would disintegrate totally by 1996.... I suppose that this phenomenal assessment is close to your personal views. Is that not so?

But you see, it is still not quite clear to me: What does America think of Reykjavik? And, generally speaking, what do the Americans want? Do they think that their President, having returned empty-handed after the Soviet leader's sensational proposals and concessions, really did a good job to America's advantage? Or that he brought back in his case -- together with the papers prepared by you or by Mr Weinberger himself -- just a pyrrhic victory?

I know that the Americans are gamblers. They love to score points. In boxing, in rugby, in baseball, in politics. But -- and here I am forced to resort to a Russian idiomatic expression -- "You shouldn't throw good money after bad." It is, after all, necessary to be aware of what has been staked on a horse, of what game you are playing, with whom, and at what time! It is, after all, necessary to understand that at such a moment, the moment of truth, it is impossible to play with marked cards -- at a moment when mankind, exhausted by nuclear fear, yearns for just one or two decisions, inspiring hope of freedom from the degrading sense of helplessness in the face of an inexorably growing catastrophe.

Not to take advantage of such a unique opportunity to conclude such a unique accord because of an illusory and absurd hope of having one more go at cornering the "Russian bear," forcing it to lick its paws, ruining the USSR, displaying America's strength, and swaggering in this role! Yes, history assigned to Mr Reagan, it really placed in his hands, a unique opportunity to build his own pedestal of a peacemaker, something of which even Mrs Nancy Reagan dreams, as people in your country write. But, carried away by the usual desire to win by even a tiny score, to gain just a few points in the usual game with which everyone is really fed up, he sacrificed this opportunity.

I was also amazed by the jokes of history itself. With whom do we have to do business when the fate of all human kind is being decided? How can one not recall the saying of the ancients: [paragraph continues]

"History repeats itself twice -- once as tragedy, the next time as farce." It is, alas, probable that the reverse may also apply -- first as a farce, and then.... What then? Could it be that tragedy is really inevitable? Could it be that this is what America wants? Could it be that this is what it expects from its President?

You may, of course, say: This is rhetoric, not a single American, including the President himself and probably you personally, wants a nuclear war. I am prepared to believe this. Then, something else probably has to be assumed: Something which was said to me by a German -- West German! -- journalist, from the Social Democratic press, it is true. He said following M.S. Gorbachev's press conference: "America needs a new Caribbean crisis to have it experience again the reality of the nuclear threat and return to honest talks." What he was referring to was the 1962 missile crisis, probably aware that in the last few years I have been particularly interested in studying the lessons of the Caribbean crisis. And here is the main conclusion I have drawn and about which I have written: At that time the USSR and U.S. leaders discovered within themselves sufficient common sense and courage to reach a compromise and avert the immediate nuclear threat. And, incidentally, via very personal and even secret diplomacy. It was indeed after this crisis -- which, I am convinced, was a shock and a terrible warning for both sides -- that the favorable process of curbing the nuclear arms race began. John Kennedy's tragic death interrupted this process. But it did not halt it. It was resumed time and again after long breaks. And we must never forget that its beginning was made at that particular dramatic moment.

I do not believe that America needs a new nuclear crisis to understand the need for the great historic compromise being offered to it by the Soviet Union. I do not believe that the American people, with their famous common sense, pragmatism, and talent perceive the stockpiling of increasingly monstrous military toys as the only means of self-salvation. Moreover, I do not believe that such a stance is fully shared by the U.S. establishment. On the contrary, we are perceiving that the internal struggle within it is being constantly exacerbated: So where is the difficulty? Why were our countries' leaders unable to reach agreement in Reykjavik?

Allow me, Mr Perle, to tell you my thoughts on this subject, and primarily to express my feelings. I am deeply disappointed but not shocked, since I have not given up hope. Actually, there was definite disappointment among all of us who were in the hall at M.S. Gorbachev's press conference, where we learned about the results of the talks -- we, the Americans, the Europeans -- both West and East, the Japanese, and the representatives of all other countries and continents. I am deeply disappointed because "happiness was so possible, so close." The sides' positions drew more closely together than ever before during the 20 years that I can remember.

Just think over the opportunities that were missed: to agree on a one-half reduction of the entire triad of strategic arms; on the complete elimination of Soviet and U.S. medium-range missiles in Europe; on the reduction of the nuclear missle potential in Asia; on the start of talks to limit and then completely ban nuclear tests; on the development of cooperation in the humanitarian sphere. This entire gigantic structure of arms limitation started tottering the moment matters reached the point of observing the ABM Treaty we have concluded. In your eyes, you are the guardians of the laws while we are the constant violators of rights. How did you manage to shake this entire structure with the help of such a lever -- the open and blatant violation of an elementary norm of international law: Pacta servanda sunt [printed in Latin] (treaties must be observed) [paragraph continued]

The Pentagon's favorite brainchild -- SDI, which serves as a cover for the entire program for a new round of the arms race on an unimaginable scale -- became the main stumbling block in the way of victory in the cause of disarmament.

I am also disappointed by something else, and at this point, to avoid being tactless, I will cite some U.S. figures. Mr O'Neill, speaker of the House of Representatives, a most astute man whom I briefly met at a reception in the U.S. Embassy in Moscow, expressed not so long ago his own bewilderment -- how can I put it more mildly, I am even embarrassed to repeat his words -- at the U.S. President's methods of working. I constantly read in your press that Americans are perturbed by the erosion of political leadership in your great country. Very much depends on advisers. On Mr Shultz, Weinberger, and you, Mr Perle. Maybe this is precisely where the greatest threat lies? The threat of not understanding the partner, his intentions, and his objective, the threat of hasty decisions. The threat of turning the grim business of war and peace into a game, just a game....

Now allow me to give some advice to you, Mr Perle, and through you to the other advisers of the U.S. President. I understand well -- you are intoxicated by the new and imposing technological potential being acquired by the United States, the West European countries, and Japan. You want to use this potential by any means in order to consolidate America's might further still, to try to impose your control on other countries and peoples. But allow me to remind you of the simplest conclusion drawn by thinkers of the past: Politics is the art of the possible, while emotions are the worst adviser in politics. Let alone intoxication, be it narcotic or technological. It leads to overestimation of one's own strength, to missed opportunities. It detaches from reality and dictates spontaneous and mistaken decisions.

Could you really expect to talk with the Soviet, the Russian people in the language of strength? Despite our might? Despite the existence of strategic parity? Despite our potential to mobilize resources which were so underestimated by Hitler's strategists and were so misjudged by the U.S. strategists who launched ,the nuclear competition after the end of World War II? Come to your senses! Take at long last at a tranquilizer, it will bring you to your senses and restore your sense of reality.

If we were to attempt to define briefly the main result of Reykjavik, I think that the following woould be most accurate: The supremacy of the new thinking. As is well known, the very idea of the new thinking was declared by our country's leadership before the present Soviet-U.S. summit meeting. It was before this meeting, mainly in the course of this year, that practical solutions emerged in outline aimed at a goal which was formerly considered completely unrealistic -- the complete elimination of nuclear weapons all over our planet.

Now our partners and even our critics abroad have seen that the new thinking is not some kind of declaration or propaganda trick, it is not an attempt to win over world public opinion and turn it aganst the U.S. Administration or to break its alliance with its NATO allies; it means specific, precisely formulated, absolutely businesslike, and realistic proposals placed on the negotiating table of the two nuclear giants' leaders.

So, how about the U.S. side? Now, of course, it is easy for us to revert to the customary tone of criticism of the White House leadership. There is nothing clever in this, especially since, as the overwhelming majority of political leaders and mass news media in the modern world admit, Washington bears the responsibility for the fact that agreements have not been reached already. [paragraph continues]

But let us look more broadly at the Reykjavik talks. Then we admit with certain gratification that, on some important questions, the U.S. side also moved from the standstill position it had maintained for a prolonged period before that.

The term compromise, and particularly the term concession, acquired a new sound in Reykjavik. Even before this meeting our country had proved that it is not afraid of making unilateral concessions, as is evidenced by the prolonged moratorium on nuclear weapon tests. In Reykjavik the Soviet leadership took steps to meet the U.S. side halfway which literally shook the West. Some people in the world may say: Did we not go rather too far long this path, are we not displaying some kind of weakness, are we not thus creating a temptation for the Americans to harden the policy of strength, the policy of pressure on us?

But, in world politics, just as in ordinary life, there are concessions -- and concessions. Imagine two physicians in consultation by the bedside of a seriously, almost hopelessly sick person. One offers to administer a potent, evey risky medicine in the hope of saving the patient's life, the other suggests that nothing be done, thus trying to aviod responsibility in the event that that patient dies anyway. Should one ask who is right in such a case?

Contemporary mankind is seriously suffering from nuclear disease. This tumor is growing year by year, swallowing vast resources and funds, and becoming increasingly threatening for mankind's life. What, in these circumstances, does it mean to make a concession in order to eliminate the cancerous tumor? Does it mean displaying weakness? No, it means displaying not only nobility, not only wisdom, but also exceptional and extraordinary daring commensurate with the prevailing situation. This is especially valid because a solution depends on accord between the two sides, because the consultation must end in consensus, in other words in agreement. We must convince the White House, we must convince all the Western partners of the need to pool efforts in order to excise the cancerous tumor. Here we also have a certain risk, because for more than 40 years now nuclear deterrence has been one of the means of preventing a new world war. But this risk is tens and hundreds of times smaller than the risk of the universal destruction of mankind and modern civilization.

Yes, all of us -- Soviet people, Americans, peoples in East and West -- must approach relations with one another in a new, a completely new fashion. So that through joint efforts we can erase the nuclear page from the world history of mankind.

Now we are all keenly interested in one specific question: Is it altogether possible to hope for successful arms limitation talks with President Ronald Reagan? Is this not an illusion? Could it be that we have to wait for time to pass -- fortunately, we do not have to wait too long -- and a new administration to come to the White House? Incidentally, that was the advice given to us -- even publicly -- by some U.S. experts, supporters of the Democratic Party. I will be frank -- for me personally, this is a very difficult question. No matter what reply I give, I would still not be completely certain. After all, the problem is, in fact, not Mr Reagan.

The time, the historical moment in which we are living -- this is the real problem. We are facing a challenge openly presented to us by America: to launch a new and fantastic round of the arms race in space and modernization of all types of weapons -- on the surface, under ground, on the seas, and under water. [paragraph continues]

Maybe this is the most difficult problem mankind has evern encountered in the history of its existence on earth. Because the choice which will be made today could prove fatal for us all. It is here, it is right here, that we have the secret behind the unbelievable efforts, the great insistence, the persistence and flexibility displayed by our leadership in talks with almost the most conservative U.S. President of the entire postwar period. Not a position of weakness, as sagacious advisers in the White House imagine, but a position of reason and a sense of responsibility.

In conclusion, I have no desire to analyze (which means to criticize) President R. Reagan's statements in Reykjavik. On the contrary, I want to emphasize something else: Following M.S. Gorbachev, the U.S. President declared that the door remains open, that efforts on arms limitation will continue. Obviously, it depends on both sides to ensure that the sensational accords which emerged in preliminary form at the talks in Iceland are not erased. Then the Reykjavik zero could turn into a 10.

Much will probably dependon the U.S. President's advisers and on U.S. public opinion. I want to say that Soviet scientists, journalists, and all Soviet public opinion will work in the direction of achieving agreement between our two countries on all fundamental questions of nuclear disarmament and the consolidation of international security.

So, what are your intentions, Mr Perle, yours and your colleagues?

P.S. I would like to suggest to THE WASHINGTON POST that it print my letter and express the hope that Mr Perle will deem it possible to join in a dialogue with us.

STRATEGIC ARMS GROUP CONFERS IN GENEVA

LD231451 Moscow TASS in English 1436 GMT 23 Oct 86

[Text] Geneva October 23 TASS -- A meeting of the group of strategic arms was held in the framework on the Soviet-American talks on nuclear and space arms here today.

SPACE ARMS GROUP MEETS IN GENEVA 28 OCT

LD281432 Moscow TASS in English 1423 GMT 28 Oct 86

[Text] Geneva October 28 TASS -- The group on space arms at Soviet-U.S. talks on nuclear and space weapons had a meeting here today.

GORBACHEV REPLIES TO ORGANIZERS OF WRITERS' FORUM

PM281037 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 28 Oct 86 First Edition p 1

["M.S. Gorbachev's Reply to a Question From the Organizers of the Sixth Sofia International Writers Meeting" -- PRAVDA headline]

[Text] Question: "What is your vision of the future of the world, mankind, and civilization?"

Answer: The question you asked me to answer is, perhaps, the chief question today. The very fact that it has been asked is a sign of optimism. We, too, are confident that there will be a future.

The best minds of mankind have always believed in the ultimate triumph of reason as an essential condition of normal human life in a community. It is a great spiritual force which enables us Soviet people, too, to be social optimists.

But the future should first and foremost be reliable for all. The only way to follow, as I see it, is to broaden the room of trust between peoples and countries. This calls for a new political thinking, orientated to the solution of the global problems of mankind rather than the arms race, to the peaceful uses of the resources and creative energies at the disposal of mankind.

The motto of your meetings is "Peace is the hope of the planet." I like very much its noble meaning.

It is this striving that pervades the Soviet concept of ensuring security for all, which proposes primarily armed reductions and disarmament. We called for the total abolition of all kinds of weapons of mass annihilation on earth by the year 2000. We have been refraining from nuclear explosions for more than a year now.

At the recent meeting with the U.S. President, Mr Reagan, in Reykjavik, the Soviet side put on the table a package of interlinked proposals which were carefully balanced from the point of view of the interests of the participants in the talks and the entire world community of states. We made concessions to the West in many ways in the hope that it would reciprocate. The main proposals of ours were 50 percent cuts in the strategic weapons, the elimination of all medium-range missiles in Europe, the strengthening of the ABM Treaty and a nuclear test ban. If the American side had accepted the package, a real process of the elimination of nuclear weapons would have got under way.

The situation after the Reykjavik meeting in spite of the well known provocative actions of the U.S. Administration and the gross misrepresentation of what came to pass at the Iceland meeting, still offers opportunities for a search for solutions. It is also a signal to all those who can and must play a role to promote detente and disarmament. Our program of disarmament benefits all.

So what is our vision of the future? We have our ideal to which we are aspiring. We are building communism, a "truly human" society, in the words of Karl Marx. We are confident that we will be able to translate into reality the great humanitarian principle behested by the founders of Marxism-Leninism: The free development of each is the condition for the free development of all. This is what the program of our party says. Everything we are doing in the economy, politics, and spiritual life is orientated to this social and humanitarian goal.

We know that, with the existence of different social systems, there are those who take exception to our ideals and concepts of the future. Views of social values also can differ. But these problems should be discussed without hypocrisy or speculation, without attempts to impose one's views on others, and with the understanding that the world is many-faceted and contradictory and that everyone -- a state, a people, society -- has the right to choose independently and to have this choice respected by others.

The Soviet Union attaches most serious importance to questions of the comprehensive development of the individual and of ensuring his rights. We are doing everything possible to make the life of our people spiritually richer, more full-bloodied and meaningful.

People sometimes ask: What can literature and the arts do in our thermonuclear age? A very great deal, I think. The main thing is to contribute to the creation of a moral atmosphere in which the arms race and the fanning of war psychosis will be considered a crime against people's very right to live.

Do not such questions as the preservation of the ever-lasting values of the past by common efforts, the protection of culture from emaciation under the onslaught of commercialism and the cult of violence and from infiltration by the degrading ideas of racism and misanthropy, the promotion of comprehensive cultural exchanges and contacts and the assertion of the ideas of peace and friendship by the means of the arts, deserve the closest possible attention? A writer can do a good deal if he is armed with honest and sincere words which care for fellow human beings.

The time has come for bold and responsible action in the interests of the world as a whole. It has come for all the peoples and all the continents.

I use the occasion to convey my best wishes to the participants in the meeting.

Bulgarian Chairman Briefs Press

LD271939 Moscow TASS in English 1837 GMT 27 Oct 86

[Text] Sofia October 27 TASS -- The text of the reply given by Mikhail Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, to the question "What is your idea of the future of the planet, mankind and civilization?" was distributed at a news conference in the Bulgarian capital today.

The question was made to the Soviet leader in writing by organizers of the 6th international writers' meeting in Sofia. The same questions were posed to the leaders of Bulgaria, the United States, India and France.

The replies by Mikhail Gorbachev, Todor Zhivkov, Ronald Reagan and Rajiv Gandhi were read out at the news conference by poet Lyubomir Levchec.

Francois Mitterand has not yet given his reply.

Levchev, who chairs the Bulgarian Writers' Union, said that the messages by those statesmen and politicians would form the starting point for a dialogue at the international meeting, which opens tomorrow, on the writers' role in joint efforts by progressive people to remove the nuclear threat.

Answering a question from a TASS correspondent about recent developments which would have a bearing also on the forthcoming debates by writers from countries with different social systems, he said:

"The Soviet-U.S. meeting in Reykjavik has certainly been an event on which our hopes and aspirations were fixed. It is especially gratifying that it is our world, the world of socialism, in the person of Mikhail Gorbachev that has put forward such an impressive program for building a future without wars and weapons.

"We have not lost hope for better prospects for Soviet-U.S. dialogue since Reykjavik. I think this will be reflected in our discussions."

The international meeting, the news conference was told, would be attended by some 200 well-known writers from 60 countries.

Pointing out the importance of a recent get-together of internationally-known cultural personalities at Issyk-Kul in Kirghizia, the USSR, which has been held on the initiative of Soviet author Chinghiz Aitmatov, Levchev said:

"We are looking forward to reports by our Soviet colleagues on the main ideas and results of the Issyk Kul forum."

CSSR NEWS CONFERENCE ON CSCE PREPARATIONS

LD242315 Moscow TASS in English 1919 GMT 24 Oct 86

[Text] Prague October 24 TASS -- The process of European detente initiated by the signing of the Helsinki Final Act should be continued, Bohuslav Kucera, chairman of the Czechoslovakian Committee for European Security and Cooperation, said at a press conference in Prague today. The press conference was devoted to the forthcoming Vienna meeting of representatives of the states participating in the Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe.

The efforts of the participants in the Vienna meeting should be aimed at making the process of European detente a reality. In spite of the unwillingness of certain Western politicians to drop their hopes to achieve military superiority, progress in that field can be ensured. Czechoslovakia unconditionally supports the proposals aimed at abolishing chemical weapons and establishing nuclear-free zones. Special importance is attached in this context to the recent initiative of the Social Democratic Party of Germany and the Social Unity Party of Germany on the establishment of a nuclear-free corridor in central Europe, the initiative which is an example of a constructive approach to a major problem of our time, Kucera stressed.

PRC-GDR COOPERATION AGREEMENT SIGNED IN BEIJING

LD241542 Moscow TASS in English 1516 GMT 24 Oct 86

[Text] Beijing October 24 TASS -- An agreement on long-term economic, scientific and technical cooperation between the People's Republic of China and the German Democratic Republic was signed here.

As reported by New China Agency, the 15-year agreement spans various fields of the economy, science and technology. It provides for increasing exchanges of products of machine-building, the electronic and electrical engineering industries, agriculture and forestry, animal husbandry and fishing, as well as for deliveries of raw materials for ferrous and non-ferrous metallurgy, the chemical industry and for cooperation in coal mining.

The signing ceremony was attended by member of the Standing Committee of the Political Bureau of the CPC CC, chairman of the PRC Li Xiannian and the general secretary of the Central Committee of the SUPG, chairman of the State Council of the GDR Erich Honecker, who is now staying on an official friendly visit in China.

A protocol on trade turnover and payments between the governments of the two countries was also signed.

JOINT PRC POWER EQUIPMENT AGREEMENT SIGNED

OW260622 Moscow in Mandarin to China 0200 GMT 25 Oct 86

[Text] Under a long-term agreement between the Soviet and Chinese Governments, documents were signed in Beijing on 24 October for supply of Soviet-made power equipment to four Chinese thermal power stations. The total power generating capacity of these four power stations is 2.1 million kilowatts. This is the largest contract for Soviet supplies of equipment to China in recent years. It is a landmark in the development of mutually beneficial cooperation between the two countries. Li Peng, member of the Political Bureau and Secretariat of the CPC Central Committee; some leaders of Chinese departments; and Troyanovskiy, Soviet ambassador to China, attended the signing ceremony.

CULTURE MINISTER ZAKHAROV ATTENDS PRC BALLET

PM261850 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 23 Oct 86 First Edition p 6

[TASS report "PRC Ballet Performs"]

[Text] Guest performances of the PRC central ballet company opened at the Kremlin Palace of Congresses theater 22 October. They have been organized in accordance with the plan for cultural cooperation between the USSR and the PRC for 1986-1987.

The company's repertoire includes world classics such as "Swan Lake," "The Cordair," and "Giselle" and also national productions such as "A Prayer for Happiness," "The Women's Red Batallion," and others.

The opening performance was attended by V.G. Zakharov, USSR minister of culture, activists of the Soviet-Chinese Friendship Society, and Li Zewang, PRC ambassador to the USSR.

CONDOLENCES ON YE JIANYING DEATH SENT TO PRC

PM280957 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 27 Oct 86 Morning Edition p 1

[USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium condolences to PRC leaders on death of Ye Jianying]

[Text] To Comrade Li Xiannian, president of the PRC, and Comrade Peng Zhen, chairman of the Standing Committee of the National's People's Congress.

Please accept our profound condolences in connection with the death of Ye Jianying, the prominent PRC statesman and politician.

Ye Jianying made a great contribution to the cause of the victory of the people's revolution and the development of the new socialist China. He is well known in the Soviet Union as a champion of strengthening friendship and cooperation between the Soviet and the Chinese peoples.

Please convey our sincere sympathy to the family and friends of the deceased.

The USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium.

PRC REJECTS POSSIBLE U.S. NUCLEAR PORT CALLS

PM271453 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 24 Oct 86 Second Edition p 4

[TASS reports under the general heading: "On Visit by U.S. Navy Ships"]

[Text] Tokyo, 23 Oct -- The U.S. Navy squadron due to pay a "courtesy visit" to the Chinese port of Qingdao 5 November includes ships capable of carrying nuclear weapons, KYODO has reported. The agency's report says that the U.S. squadron will consist of three ships, two of which -- the guided missile cruiser "Reeves" and the destroyer "Oldendorf," based in the Japanese port of Yokosuka -- are capable of carrying missiles with nuclear warheads.

Beijing, 23 Oct -- At a briefing for foreign and Chinese journalists a PRC Foreign Ministry Press Department spokesman replied to a request to comment on KYODO's report that two of the three U.S. warship due to visit the Chinese pot of Qingdao may be carrying nuclear weapons by reiterating China's position on this question. He stated that foreign warships with nuclear weapons on board are not allowed to put in to Chinese ports.

SAVENKOV ON PRC STATE CONTROL OF ENTERPRISES

PM280955 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 27 Oct 86 Morning Edition p 4

[Own correspondent Yu. Savenkov dispatch: "China"]

[Text] Beijing -- According to Zhou Zhiyin, a leading expert in the area of economic planning, state control of enterprises will weaken in the course of the economic reform in China in the next 5 years and free market trade will be encouraged. By 1990 most enterprises in the state sector will have switched to the system of taking full responsiblity for their profits and losses. At the moment the state as a rule subsidizes enterprises' losses.

CONTINUED COVERAGE OF KIM IL-SONG VISIT

Talks With Gorbachev

PM211254 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 25 Oct 86 First Edition p 1

[TASS Report: "Talks in the Kremlin"]

[Text] Talks were held in the Kremlin 24 October between Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, and Kim Il-song, general secretary of the Korean Workers' Party [KWP] Central Committee, president of the DPRK, who is on a friendly visit in the USSR. Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev and Kim Il-song exchanged opinions on the development of Soviet-Korean relations. Satisfaction was expressed with the dynamic rise in party, political, economic, and cultural ties.

It was noted that possibilities exist to deepen bilateral relations in all areas of cooperation. The great importance of the Soviet-Korean treaty on friendship, cooperation, and mutual assistance was stressed. The readiness was confirmed to further strengthen and to perfect by all means possible relations between the CPSU and the KWP and the USSR and the DPRK on the basis of the principles of Marxism-Leninism and socialist internationalism.

Kim Il-song gave details of the achievements of the working people of the DPRK in the struggle for the implementation of the decisions of the Sixth Korean Workers' Party Congress, for the relaxation of tension on the Korean peninsula and for the peaceful unification of their homeland. Comrade Gorbachev described how the CPSU and Soviet people are working on the fulfillment of the decisions of the Party's 27th Congress.

Discussing the present-day situation in the world, both leaders noted the special importance being assumed by cooperation of the socialist countries and all progressive forces in the struggle against the danger of war and the aggressive aspirations of imperialism, and for the maintenance of a stable peace and the development of international cooperation.

Kim Il-song declared full support for the constructive position adopted by the Soviet side at the Soviet-American meeting in Reykjavik, which creates a unique opportunity for the elimination of nuclear weapons and for a historic breakthrough in the development of international relations. According special attention to the situation in Asia, the leaders of the two parties voiced serious concern at the growing tension in the region as a result of the actions of the aggressive forces of imperialism and militarism. In these circumstances, the sides maintained, great importance is being assumed by the cooperation of all progressive forces in Asia to ensure security and develop broad, mutually advantageous and genuinely equitable cooperation on the continent.

An inalienable component in the setting up of a security system in the Far East and Asia as a whole is the easing of tension and the normalization of the situation on the Korean Peninsula and the earliest resolution of the Korean question. The Soviet side fully supports the DPRK's efforts aimed at the pull-out of U.S. troops and nuclear weapons from South Korea, at turning the peninsula into a nuclear-free, peaceful zone, and arriving at the peaceful democratic unification of the country without interference from outside. The sides believe that the new Soviet proposals on medium-range missiles in Asia that were put forward at the Soviet-American meeting in Reykjavik fully meet the interests of the implementation of these noble goals.

The talks passed off in a warm and cordial atmosphere and demonstrated a common approach on the part of the two fraternal parties to the fundamental questions of present-day world development.

Taking part in the talks were, on the Soviet side: Shevardnadze, member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo, USSR minister of foreign affairs; Medvedev, secretary of the CPSU Central Committee; and Shubnikov, USSR ambassador to the DPRK; and on the Korean side, Ho Tam, member of the Politburo and secretary of the KWP Central Committee; Kim Yong-nam, member of the Politburo and minister of foreign affairs of the DPRK; and Kwon Hui-kyong, DPRK ambassador to the USSR.

More on Talks

PM271155 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 26 Oct 86 First Edition p 1

[TASS report: "M.S. Gorbachev's Meeting with Kim Il-song"]

[Text] A meeting between M.S. Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, and Kim Il-song, general secretary of the Workers Party of Korea Central Committee and DPRK president, was held in the Kremlin 24 October.

Some questions of the development and deepening of cooperation between the two fraternal parties and countries were discussed. An exchange of opinions took place on a number of topical problems of the present-day international situation.

The conversation proceeded in an atmosphere of cordiality, friendship, and mutual understanding.

Kim Il-song conveyed to M.S. Gorbachev an invitation to visit the DPRK. The invitation was accepted with gratitude.

Kremlin Dinner

LD241621 Moscow TASS in English 1602 GMT 24 Oct 86

[Text] Moscow October 24 TASS -- The CPSU Central Committee and the Presidium of the Supreme Soviet of the USSR today held a dinner in the Grand Kremlin Palace in honour of Kim Il-song, general secretary of the Central Committee of the Worker's Party of Korea, president of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea.

Presnt from the Soviet side were Mikhail Gorbachev, Andrey Gromyko, Nikolay Ryzhkov and other leaders of the Communist Party and the Soviet State.

Mikhail Gorbachev and Kim Il-song exchanged speeches during the dinner that passed in a warm friendly atmosphere. The speeches were heard with much attention and received with prolonged applause.

Gorbachev Dinner Speech

PM271157 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 26 Oct 86 First Edition p 2

[TASS Report: "In a Friendly Atmosphere"]

[Text] Moscow October 24 TASS -- Mikhail Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, today made the following speech at a Kremlin dinner for Kim Il-song, general secretary of the Central Committee of the Workers' Party of Korea and president of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea:

Esteemed Comrade Kim Il-song,

Esteemed Korean friends,

Comrades,

It is with a sincere feeling of friendship and comradeship that I greet you here, in the Kremlin, in a circle of comrades in arms in the common communist cause.

Comrade Kim Il-song and I have had interesting and substantive talks. We thoroughly discussed the issues of Soviet-Korean relations, the situation in the Far East, and pressing international problems. The considerations voiced by Comrade Kim Il-song, a prominent and experienced leader of the international working-class and Communist movement, during the conversations have been valuable to us.

The outcome of the talks is unequivocal: They have borne out once again a shared desire to develop cooperation and exchanges of experience in the building of socialsm in every way and to interact in efforts to improve the situation in Asia and the Pacific Basin and avert a nuclear catastrophe towards which mankind is being pushed by imperialism's aggressive and dangerous policy.

We have noted with satisfaction that contacts between the CPSU and the Workers Party of Korea have developed well in the past few years and relations in the economy and culture have become more intense. Soviet-Korean cooperation has risen to new level in all spheres of life. It faithfully serves the further rapproachment of our peoples and states and the cause of socialism.

But there still is ample room for growth in our cooperation. Together with Comrade Kim Il-song we have come to unanimous opinion that it is important to continue deepening and diversifying trade and economic relations, jointly look for new fields of scientific and technological cooperation, and interact more closely and vigorously on the international scene to ensure our peaceful interests and goals. The main thing is that there is a desire to raise the level of our cooperation markedly.

Soviet people are well aware of the difficult conditions in which the Korean people have to build a socialist society. The country's split, caused by reactionary forces of the South and American imperialism, has continued for four decades now. Washington has thrust its nuclear systems like splinters deep into the body of Korea, the body of Asia. All this has been done with one sinister aim, that of impeding social progress and turning the clock of history back.

Soviet people support the Korean people's rightful cause -- the reunification of their homeland -- with all their hearts. It is clear enough that the road to unification lies not only through the Korean Peninsula. It is linked inseparably with common efforts against imperialist policy in Asia and the Pacific, real improvements in the entire situation there, and the development of goodneighbourly relations.

Look at what is now happening in the Far East and the Asian-Pacific region. There is on station there one of the largest American contingents, which numbers 360,000 men. There are 32 American military bases in Japan and another 40 in South Korea. One should add here plans to forge a bloc of Washington, Tokyo and Seoul with the involvement of also other states. Judging by all appearances, it should be a kind of "eastern NATO". This indeed poses a real threat to the USSR and the DPRK and to many other countries, and to the cause of peace.

The Soviet position has been set forth plainly and in detail at Vladivostok. We are glad that our ideas and proposals have met with a favorable response from many governments, political parties and mass organizations in the Asian-Pacific region. It is good that a keen interese has been awakened in the search for avenues of constructive cooperation at regional and continental levels.

I would like to stress once again: The meaning, content and thrust of the Soviet initiatives is in making sure that the opinions and interests of all states in that region be taken into account and ensured in practice. The interests of all Asian states, we are certain, are common in that there must be no neo-globalism and great-power attitudes and no coercion of peoples into joining military groups. No one has the right to command, foist one's will on others, or delineate the world map into zones of one's influence and interests.

Such colonialist ways have long been rejected by history and the world community. Attempts at reviving them meet with ever more active and determined opposition by the peoples.

There still are in the world, of course, quite a few of those who are attempting to put a spoke in the wheels of historical progress. When we urge a new political mentality and a deep awareness that nuclear conflicts are inadmissible and explain that such a course of events is fatally dangerous to civilization, we realize full well the colossal amount of work that will have to be tackled and the intricacy of the knots that will have to be untangled.

It can only be regretted that in Reykjavik it has not proved possible to reach agreement to incarnate the key problems of bringing about disarmament and eliminating the nuclear threat into binding accords.

We went there, as is known, with a whole number of important initiatives concerning the whole gamut of problems of nuclear-missile disarmament and made major concessions with the aim of taking the talks out of the deadlock but everything, alas, ran up once more against the American "Star Wars" program.

Although a unique chance has been passed up, an agreement meeting the vital interests of the entire world community is attainable. We believe in the common sense of the peoples, including the American people. The Reykjavik meeting has confirmed that work has to be kept up and a maximum of political courage and good will displayed.

When we say that it is the time to act, we certainly have in mind also the vital problems of Asia and the Pacific Basin.

Our constructive proposals for sizable cuts in the medium-range nuclear missiles deployed there offer new opportunities for detente. We think that the implementation of these proposals could help substantially also the Korean people's efforts to lower tension, strengthen peace in the Korean peninsula, and make it a nuclear-free zone. In the final analysis, this wil be conducive to favorable conditions for achieving the country's peaceful unification.

Comrades,

Summing up our domestic affairs, one can say with full reason that the decisions of the 27th Congress of the CPSU and the mood for thorough-going qualitative change are steadily coverting into a material force that is quickening our progress.

We are, of course, aware of all the difficulties involved in coping with the tasks that are facing us. Everyone and all will have to put in quite an effort, working real hard and conscientiously. But we have profound faith in our socialist social system and the spiritual power of the working masses. There have been many a steep slope in the way of the Soviet people but they have always negotiated them with honour. This one will also be surmounted.

We are especially inspired by the fact that we work in a fraternal socialist community, in close and all-round cooperation with the socialist countries. We are now confronted by the task of elevating socialist economic integration to a new level. We are going to remove all artificial hurdles and impediments from the path of direct cooperation between work collectives and make full use of the reserves and advantages of the socialist economic system.

Esteemed Comrade Kim Il-song,

Esteemed Korean friends,

We know how selflessly the people of your country are working to fulfill the tasks set by the 6th Congress of the Workers Party of Korea. Soviet people have great respect for the Korean people, their capacity for work, energies and dedication to the great cause of the homeland's unification.

We wish you further success in carrying out the wide-ranging constructive plans of the Workers' Party of Koreas for building a socialist society on Korean soil, advancing the economy and culture, and improving the people's well-being. We wish happiness and prosperity to every Korean family.

Let the indissoluble fraternal friendship of the Soviet and Korean peoples grow stronger.

Long live peace and socialism!

Kim Il-song Dinner Speech

PM271441 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 27 Oct 86 First Edition p 2

[TASS account of speech by Kim Il-song, general secretary of the Workers Party of Korea Central Committee and DPRK president, at dinner given in his honor in the Great Kremlin Palace in Moscow 25 October, published under the general heading "In a Friendly Atmosphere"]

[Text] Esteemed Comrade Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev!

Esteemed comrade leaders of the CPSU and the Soviet state!

Comrades and friends!

We are pleased that, in the course of our present visit to the Soviet Union, the country of class brothers, we have been fortunate to have an important meeting with leaders of the CPSU and the Soviet state headed by Comrade Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev and to share warm feelings of friendship with the fraternal Soviet people.

Allow me to express to you, Comrade Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev, heartfelt gratitude for the kind invitation, warm welcome, and cordial hospitality, and for the remarkable speech you have just delivered, a speech filled with feelings of comradely friendship and trust.

During our meeting today you and I conducted in a comradely and friendly atmosphere sincere talks and conversations on questions of the present international situation, questions of developing and strengthening the relations of friendship and cooperation between our two countries, the DPRK and the USSR, and also a broad range of other questions of mutual interest.

These meetings and talks enabled us, the leaders of the two countries, to deepen the relations of comradeship and friendship and to reaffirm the firm resolve and shared desire of our parties, states, and peoples to struggle, hand in hand until the victorious conclusion, against imperialism and war, in defense of peace and security throughout the world, and for the sake of completing the great cause of socialism and communism.

I am deeply convinced that our visit, keynoted by the profound attention and exceptional hospitality shown by the Soviet comrades, will produce good results.

In the last few years new changes in the life of Soviet society and in socialist building have taken place in the Soviet Union under the leadership of the CPSU headed by Comrade Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev.

The 27th CPSU Congress, held at the beginning of this year, confirmed as the party's strategic line the course of accelerating the country's socioeconomic development -- a course elaborated by the CPSU Central Committee April (1985) Plenum -- mapped out an active peace policy, and thus created bright prospects along the path of the Soviet people who are struggling for socialism and communism.

Engaged in active organizational and political work to implement the party congress decisions, the CPSU is aiming for revolutionary changes in all areas of social life. The party's leading role has been enhanced, the human factor's role is growing, organization and discipline in social life are strengthening. [paragraph continues]

Thanks to the selfless struggle waged by the Soviet people, inspired by the party congress decisions, work is progressing energetically in the economy's intensification on a high scientific and technical base, the enhancement of production efficiency, and the comprehensive improvement of socialism.

These new changes that are taking place in the Soviet Union today are unimaginable in isolation from the energetic activity of Comrade Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev, staunch Marxist-Leninist and talented political figure.

The Korean people are sincerely pleased with the new revolutionary changes which have recently occurred in the Soviet Union, and express the wish that the fraternal Soviet people, closely rallied around the CPSU, will achieve impressive successes in the future in the struggle for the implementation of the 27th Party Congress decisions.

The cause of socialism and communism is the common cause of the working class and the peoples of the whole world. The communists and peoples of our two countries, Korea and the Soviet Union, have for a long time fought jointly in the name of common goals and ideals. The fraternal Soviet people, displaying noble international spirit, shed their blood to help our people in their struggle for the rebirth of the motherland and, whenever our revolution experienced difficulties, gave us moral support and material help. Today the Soviet people, invariably loyal to their duty as class brothers and allies, are continuing to give our people active support and assistance in their struggle for the building of socialism and the independent peaceful unification of the motherland. Our people will never forget this and are grateful for it.

The relations of friendship and cooperation between the peoples of the two countries, Korea and the Soviet Union, are currently rising to a new high level of development in line with the spirit of the accords reached at the meetings and talks between the two countries' leaders here in Moscow 2 years ago and are experiencing all-around flourishing in all spheres of politics, the economy, culture, and military matters.

To incessantly strengthen and develop the relations of friendship and cooperation between Korea and the Soviet Union, which have deep historical roots and are built on class relations of alliance -- this is the invariable course of our party and the republic's government, this is the unanimous desire of the entire Korean people.

Our people will continue to always march shoulder to shoulder with the fraternal Soviet people in the united ranks of the struggle against imperialism and for peace, socialism, and communism, and will apply all efforts for the further development of the relations of friendship and cooperation between our countries on the basis of proletarian internationalism.

Comrades and friends!

At present mankind bears the burden of a serious task -- to prevent a thermonuclear world war and to preserve peace and security on the planet.

International tension is growing more and more each day, and peace and security in the world are facing a serious danger through the U.S. imperialists' aggressive and inflammatory actions. Unless the U.S. ruling circles' adventurist attempts aimed at launching a nuclear war are stopped short and thwarted, irreparable calamities and a catastrophe will befall our planet.

Nuclear war, which threatens mankind's life and its civilization, must be prevented at all costs, and peace must be definitely preserved, in accordance with the yearnings of all peoples.

Peace is the noble ideal of socialism, and the struggle for peace is the invariable policy of the socialist state. History has proudly recorded in its annals the fact that the Decree on Peace was the first law promulgated by the newly born Soviet power of the socialist state. From the very first day of its appearance in the historical arena, the socialist state has held aloft the banner of peace, it has invariably struggled and is struggling for the prevention of war and the preservation of peace.

Socialism today is the great anti-imperialist revolutionary force of our epoch, a force opposing imperialism. Forming a broad united front with all peace-loving forces on the globe, the socialist countries must launch a powerful antiwar and antinuclear movement of peace champions, stop short and thwart the imperialists' attempts aimed at launching a nuclear war, and safeguard peace and security on earth.

Proceeding from noble feelings of responsibility for the great cause of peace on our planet, the CPSU and the Soviet state have put forward a number of peace-loving initiatives and proposals on banning nuclear tests and reducing nuclear weapons, preventing the militarization of space and completely eliminating nuclear and chemical weapons by the end of this century, and transforming the Asian-Pacific region into a nuclear-free zone, a zone of peace and cooperation, and are making sincere efforts for their implementation. Last August the Soviet Union made the decision to extend again the unilateral moratorium on nuclear tests through 1 January 1987. On the Soviet Union's iniative a Soviet-U.S. summit meeting was held recently in Reykjavik, where the USSR made a bold initiative and constructive proposals aimed at the reduction of nuclear arms and applied sincere efforts for their implementation. Thus the Soviet Union displayed with utmost clarity its responsibility for the preservation of peace and security on earth, the immutable nature of the Leninist peace-loving policy.

We actively support the Soviet Union's peace initiatives aimed at preserving peace and security on our planet and highly value the efforts made by the CPSU, and Soviet state, and the USSR people for their implementation.

The easing of the tension prevailing in Asia and the Korean Peninsula is a highly important aspect of the preservation of peace and security on the globe.

The U.S. imperialists, claiming world domination, are stepping up aggressive intrigues in the Asian-Pacific region, attaching great strategic importance to the Korean peninsula, this important military bridgehead in Asia. The United States, proceeding from its strategic objective of committing aggression against the Northern part of our republic and the Asian socialist countries, is using South Korea as a springboard, building up nuclear arms and aggressive armed forces there on a large scale. Their intrigues aimed at knocking together a military triangle comprising the United States, Japan, and South Korea are becoming increasingly evident.

The situation in Asia and the Korean peninsula is becoming increasingly serious in view of the fact that Japanese militarism has turned into a dangerous aggressive force which openly propounds its sinister intentions of overseas expansion. Recently Japan's ruling circles joined in the U.S. "Star Wars" plan, which is unanimously condemned by progressive peoples in the world. This is a very bad sign.

Our party and the republic's government are making tireless efforts for the easing of tension and preservation of peace in Asia and the Korean peninsula and for the peaceful solution of the problem of Korea's unification. For the sake of solving this problem independently and on peaceful principles we have put forward numerous rational and constructive proposals for the unification of the motherland, including the proposal to form a Democratic Confederal Republic of Korea. This year we put forward the proposal to hold talks between military authorities and the peaceful proposal to establish a nuclear-free peace zone in the Korean peninsula.

Since they are just, our proposals on the unification of the motherland and our peace initiatives enjoy active support from most countries and peoples in the world.

Last July Comrade Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev, speaking in Vladivostok, devoted serious attention to the development of the situation in the Korean peninsula and its adjoining regions, condemned the U.S. intrigues aimed at building up nuclear arms in South Korea and knocking together a United States-Japan-South Korea military triangle, and expressed high appreciation and total support for our proposals on the unification of the motherland and our peace initiatives. This is a great inspiration for our people who are struggling for the independent peaceful unification of the motherland.

I would like to take this opportunity to express deep gratitude to the CPSU, the Soviet State, and the entire Soviet people for their active support of our people's great revolutionary cause, whose objective is the unification of the motherland and the building of socialism.

The Korean people, bearing aloft the banner of Marxism-Leninism and proletarian internationalism and in close cooperation with the fraternal socialist countries, will energetically further the building of socialism, thus making a great contribution to the sacred cause of the international working class struggling for the triumph of the ideals of communism.

I am convinced that our present visit to the Soviet Union will undoubtedly give a powerful impetus to the revolutionary struggle and building of the peoples of both countries, the DPRK and the USSR, and will make useful contribution to strengthening the unity and cohesion of the socialist countries and the international communist movement.

Allow me, in this remarkable place where the warm feeling of comradeship and friendship reigns, to wish eternal flourishing to the Soviet Union and happiness to the whole Soviet people.

May the militant friendship and cohesion between the parties, states, and peoples of Korea and the Soviet Union be eternal and unbreakable!

PRAVDA Notes Kim Activities

PM271405 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 27 Oct 86 First Edition p 1

[TASS report: "Becoming Acquainted With Moscow"]

[Text] On 25 October Kim Il-song, general secretary of the Workers Party of Korea [WPK] Central Committee and president of the DPRK, familiarized himself with Moscow. He visited places connected with the historical and architectural sights of the capital.

Kim Il-song visited Krylatskiy Rayon -- one of the rayons where new housing is being buildt on a massive scale. [paragranph continues]

Here he had a conversation with leaders of the Moscow Gorispolkom and Kuntsevskiy Rayon about the progress and prospects of developing housing and construction and also the construction of social, cultural, and consumer projects.

On 26 October Kim Il-song, general secretary of the WPK Central Committee and president of the DPRK, visited the USSR Exhibition of National Economic Achievements and viewed the exhibition "Science, Technology, Production-86."

The guest was familiarized with how new forms of science and production integration are being introduced in practice in our country.

Attention was also devoted to new technological processes for manufacturing machines and mechanisms, the creation of new materials with preprogrammed properties, and the use of the achievements of chemical science in the national economy.

The DPRK leader surveyed the "Vega" automatic space station. It is with the aid of this kind of station that research has been conducted into the planet Venus and Hailey's Comet. He was also shown a large exhibition of Soviet computer equipment.

Kim Il-song was accompanied by V.A. Medvedev, secretary of the CPSU Central Committee; P.G. Gilashvili, deputy chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium; and other officials.

Farewell Ceremony

LD270933 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 0830 GMT 27 Oct 86

[Text] Kim Il-song, general secretary of the Central Committee of the Korean Workers Party and president of the DPRK, who has been in our country on a friendly visit at the invitation of the CPSU Central Committee General Secretary Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev has left Moscow for home.

In the Georgiyev Hall of the Great Kremlin Palace there was a send-off ceremony for the DPRK leader.

Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev warmly took his leave of Kim Il-song and wished him a good journey.

Present at the ceremony was Comrade Ryzhkov, member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo and chairman of the USSR council of Ministers.

At the airport, where a cortege of vehicles arrived from the Kremlin accompanied by an honor escort of motorcycle riders, Kim Il-song was seen off by Comrades Ligachev, Medvedev, and other officials.

HONECKER BEGINS TALKS WITH BATMONH IN MPR

LD261840 Moscow TASS in English 1610 GMT 26 Oct 86

[Text] Ulaanbaatar October 26 TASS -- Erich Honecker, general secretary of the Central Committee of the Socialist Unity Party of Germany, president of the GDR State Council, arrived here today for an official friendly visit.

The honored guest was welcomed in the airport by Jambyn Batmonh, general secretary of the Central Committee of the Mongolian People's Revolutionary Party, and other Mongolian leaders.

On the same day talks were started between Jambyn Batmonh and Erich Honecker. The sides discussed the relations between Mongolia and the GDR and problems of the international situation. They pointed out that the Soviet-American summit meeting in Reykjavik had been an event of major significance. It was necessary in the present-day complicated international situation.

The GDR and Mongolian leaders emphasized that the deeply realistic stand of the Soviet Union in Reykjavik had taken into account both the interests of the USSR and the U.S., and those of all the countries and peoples. They pointed out that Mongolia and the GDR highly appreciated the vigorous and principled activities of Mikhail Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, during the meeting itself and for the sake of consolidating its positive results.

Participants in the talks stated that the results of the Soviet-American meeting had put the struggle for nuclear disarmament to a qualitatively new level. They will promote further activization of efforts of the peace-minded forces aimed at warding off the menace of a nuclear war.

Departs After Visit

LD280922 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 0700 GMT 28 Oct 86

[Text] Erich Honecker, general secretary of the SED Central Committee and chairman of the GDR Council of state, left Ulaanbaatar today. He was in Mongolia on a 3-day official visit at the invitation of Jambyn Batmonh, general secretary of the MPRP Central Committee and chairman of the Presidium of the MPR People's Greal Hural. During the meetings and negotiations, which took place in an atmosphere of fraternity and mutual understanding, both leaders unanimously expressed the deep commitment of the MPR and GDR to consolidate the peace and security of peoples and full support for the large-scale peace initiatives of the Soviet Union.

CHAIRMAN OF GOSSNAB RECEIVES MPR'S GOTOB

PM241515 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 22 Oct 86 Morning Edition p 5

[TASS report: "Conversation Held"]

[Text] On 20 October L.A. Voronin, deputy chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers and chairman of the USSR Gossnab, received D. Gotob, chairman of the Mongolian State Committee for Material and Technical Supply, who is visiting Moscow. During the conversation, which passed in a warm, friendly atmosphere, there was an exchange of opinions on questions of further developing bilateral cooperation.

AUCCTU'S DELEGATION RETURNS FROM MONGOLIA

POM241427 Moscow TRUD in Russian 19 Oct 86 p 1

[Unattributed report: "Delegation Returns"]

[Text] The Soviet trade union delegation headed by AUCCTU Secretary V.M. Mishin returned to Moscow yesterday from Ulaanbaatar, where it took part in a conference of secretaries and section chiefs of socialist countries' trade union centers discussing issues relating to educational and mass cultural work by trade unions.

LAST OF SIX REGIMENTS LEAVES DRA FOR HOME

LD271836 Moscow TASS in English 1829 GMT 27 Oct 86

[Text] Kunduz, Afghanistan October 27 TASS -- People living in this city today bid a ceremonial farewell to the last of the six Soviet regiments being returned home in keeping with a joint decision by the governments of the USSR and Afghanistan.

The seeing-off rally was attended by Mohammad Aslam Watanjar, a member of the Political Bureau of the Central Committee of the People's Democratic Party of Afghanistan (PDPA) and communications minister of the Democratic Repubic of Afghanistan, Mir Sahib Karwal, a secretary of the PDPA Central Committee, and other officials.

The CPSU Central Committee's message of greeting to the internationalist troops coming back home from Afghanistan was read out.

Watanjar thanked the Soviet troops warmly for the tremendous assistance they had given to the Afghan people.

The decision to return part of the limited Soviet military contingent home, he said, attested to a real wish by the Governments of the USSR and Afghanistan for the situation around Afghanistan to go back to normal.

Describing this decision as an event of great historical significance, Watanjar said the exploit performed by the internationalist troops would remain a symbol of Afghan-Soviet friendship for ever.

Lieutenant-Colonel V. Sokolov, commander of the anti-aircraft regiment, was handed an honorary banner of the PDPA Central Committee, the revolutionary Council and the Council of Ministers of Afghanistan and a sculpture called "Brotherhood-in-arms".

A large group of Soviet anti-aircraft gunners were presented with Soviet and Afghan awards.

DOBRYNIN MEETS WITH INDIAN COMMUNIST OFFICIAL

PM281031 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 26 Oct 86 First Edition p 4

["Meeting in the CPSU Central Committee" -- PRAVDA headline]

[Text] Moscow October 24 TASS -- Anatoliy Dobrynin, a secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, on 24 October had a meeting with Rajeshwara Rao, general secretary of the National Council of the Communist Party of India, who is in Moscow en route from the Mongolian People's Republic to India.

In the course of their conversation the sides had an exchange of opinion on urgent present-day problems related to the struggle for peace and against the threat of nuclear war. They also touched upon some questions of the international communist movement.

Anatoliy Dobrynin told Rajeshwara Rao how the CPSU and the Soviet people as a whole were working to translate into practice the resolutions of the 27th CPSU Congress on the accleration of the socio-economic development of the country and on raising the living standards of the Soviet people.

The secretary of the CPSU Central Committee dwelt on the results of the Soviet-American meeting in Reykjavik and stressed specifically the importance of the large-scale Soviet proposals made at that meeting.

Rajeshwara Rao spoke highly of the foreign policy activities of the CPSU and the Soviet Government. He stressed that the Indian communists enthusiastically supported the Soviet Union's broad initiatives, put forward by Mikhail Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, in Reykjavik, the initiatives paving the way to the normalization of the international situation, the prevention of nuclear war and the maintenance of world peace. Rajeshwara Rao noted that the communist party of India was making great efforts to unfold the anti-war movement and involve in it the broadest sections of the Indian people.

Rajeshwara Rao said that the Indian communists were attaching much importance to the invigoration of the struggle against the intrigues of imperialism and domestic reaction in India and for the consolidation of the national independence, unity and territorial integrity of the country and for the vital interests of the working people.

The representatives of the CPSU and the Communist Party of India expressed a mutual desire for the further strengthening of fraternal ties between the two parties and the all-around development of friendship and cooperation between the USSR and India.

INDIAN METALLURGICAL COOPERATION PROTOCOL SIGNED

PM241403 Moscow SOTSIALISTICHESKAYA INDUSTRIYA in Russian 19 Oct 86 p 3

[TASS correspondent S. Karmalito Delhi dispatch: "Ties Developing Successfully"]

[Text] A protocol on current and long-term cooperation between the USSR and India in the sphere of ferrous metallurgy has been signed in the Indian capital. It notes with satisfaction the successful development of Soviet-Indian ties in this important sector of the economy and expresses the intention to continue developing them on the basis of large-scale, long-term agreements between the two countries.

The protocol points out that a number of questions connected with expanding the state metallurgical plants at Bhilai and Bokaro built with the USSR's assistance were discussed during the talks held here between S.V. Kolpakov, USSR minister of ferrous metallurgy, and K.C. Pant, Indian minister of steel and mines. The projects under way envisage increasing the capacity of each of these enterprises to 4 million metric tons of steel per year. At present they account for more than one-third of all steel smelted in India.

In addition there was a discussion of the possiblities of retooling the plant at Bokaro and, in particular, reconstructing shops and introducing a continuous steel casting process. Progress made in building a new ferrous metallurgy installation in India with Soviet assistance -- the plant at Vishakhapatnam, which is planned to go into operation in 1988 -- was also discussed at the talks.

TASS DETAILS USSR-FRANCE JOINT SPACE MISSION

LD271910 Moscow TASS in English 1852 GMT 27 Oct 86

[Text] Yerevan October 27 TASS -- A Soviet-French space crew will make a joint flight in the second half of 1988, which will last for about a month and be named after Mt Aragats, the highest peak in Armenia.

This decision was taken by a Soviet-French meeting on the exploration and use of outer space for peaceful purposes, which was devoted to 20 years of the two countries' cooperation in the field and ended in Yerevan today.

Studies planned for the new joint mission include, among others, monitoring the state of the bone tissue, cardivascular physiology and nervous-sensory activity of people in space.

The French cosmonaut is to make a spacewalk during the flight for an extravehicular experiment related to the spaceship's design.

The attending Soviet and French scientists reaffirmed their interest in a joint study of Mars and the smaller bodies of the solar system. They decided to continue experiments in this field.

Experiments are planned also in biotechnology, namely protein crystallization and electrophoresis.

A communiqe adopted at the meeting spoke positively of the Soviet satellite Astron which had been in orbit for more than three years and carried an unlraviolet telescope jointly developed by Soviet and French experts.

Planned space meteorological studies include a joint experiment concerning the radiation balance and atmosphere sensing by means of a laser locator.

The biosputnik project, involving a biosatellite to be launched in 1987, will hold a special place among joint efforts.

TASS VIEWS KOHL INTERVIEW ON WASHINGTON VISIT

LD242013 Moscow TASS in English 1950 GMT 24 Oct 86

[Text] Moscow October 24 TASS -- TASS Political News Analyst Aleksey Shestakov writes:

Federal Chancellor Helmut Kohl was the first head of government to hurry on a visit to Washington after the latest Soviet-American summit. He described the goals of his visit in an interview to the West German ZDF TV programme as "stock-taking" after Reykjavik and expression of "gratitude" to the U.S. president for his having stood up staunchly for Western interests.

Kohl was doing "stock-taking" and lavishing praise on the President simultaneously and it sometimes seemed that the wild idea had become reality and the West German chancellor talked English, like the U.S. President, and not German. I always thought the U.S. did the right thing by pursuing SDI research and we as the Federal Government supported it, Kohl told an NBC TV programme, and added that the Reykjavik meeting would have been impossible without SDI. Then he patted himself on the back for having deployed U.S. first-strike nuclear weapons, Pershing-2 and cruise missiles, in West German territory and, echoing Reagan, threw overboard Reagan's "zero option" on those armaments. "When you ponder a situation in Europe and the intermediate-range nuclear forces, it is clear that they cannot merely be taken away and abolished," Kohl said.

Here is good old schooling for you! The U.S. Administration was clearly unwilling to accept its own "zero option" put before it in Reykjavik (renunciation of the Pershings in exchange for the renunciation of the Soviet SS-20 missiles) and it blocked it along with the entire Soviet package of proposals. Immediately the federal chancellor, who had until recently been clamouring for "world with the progressively lower amounts of weaponry" and asserting that the American Pershings in West Germany were merely a counter balance to the Soviet SS-20's, began to claim that those missiles could not be merely abolished. American propaganda is either ignoring or misrepresenting the Soviet proposal on freezing the numbers of missiles with ranges of less than 1,000 km and on immediate talks on this problem. The chancellor is pretending, too, that there has been no such proposal. He keeps talking about "the Russians' overwhelming superiority in conventional weapons," disregarding in so doing both objective figures, which show that there is no such superiority, and the absolutely concrete proposals of the Warsaw Treaty member countries in that field: the NATO countries, including West Germany, are yet to reply to the "Budapest Initiative" put forward a few months ago.

The loyalty of Bonn to Washington is obvious not only to Moscow. Why then should Chancellor Kohl say in a number of interviews to the U.S. press, "I am not America's arms-bearer?" Why should he keep repeating heart-rending stories about free soup he had been given as a teenager by the Americans after the war?

Helmut Kohl is fond of pointing out in his public statements that he has been a politician "since school years." Such an early start in politics in indeed noteworthy, as is his unchanged political stand ever since that time. Meanwhile, it is not enough for today's statesman just to cram in a lesson. The present age calls for new political thinking because it alone can keep the world from stepping over the last dangerous line.

SHIKIN APPOINTED AMBASSADOR TO AUSTRIA

AU201227 Vienna DIE PRESSE in German 18-19 Oct 86 p 1

[Text] The career diplomat Shikin will be the Soviet Union's new representative in Vienna. At present Shikin is the first deputy chief of the Third European Department in the Soviet Foreign Ministry and responsible for the FRG. By appointing the relatively young diplomat, who speaks German well and who is known to be a very tough negotiator, the Soviet Union has broken with the previous practice of sending meritorius, high-ranking politicans such as Ambassador Mikhail Yefremov to Vienna. So far, Moscow has not asked for the Austrian Government's agreement.

REPORTAGE ON UK DIPLOMATIC BREAK WITH SYRIA

UK Relations With Syria

LD241445 Moscow TASS in English 1438 GMT 24 Oct 86

[Text] London October 24 TASS -- The British Government has decided to sever diplomatic relations with the Syrian Arab Republic, it was officially announced here.

The obviously invented allegations about Syria's involvement in an attempt to blow up an Israeli air line in London airport is being used as a pretext for this unfriendly and provocative step.

It is well known that the Syrian leadership has repeatedly condemned terrorism and emphatically rejected all attempts to link Syria with such acts.

Syria Severs Relations

LD241917 Moscow TASS in English 1906 GMT 24 Oct 86

[Text] Damascus October 24 TASS -- The Government of the Syrian Arab Republic severed diplomatic relations with Great Britain and closed Syrian airspace and sea ports to British planes and vessels. This step is an answer to Great Britain's provocative decision to rupture diplomatic relations with Syria, a statement of the Syrian Government says. The Syrian Arab Republic categorically rejects the groundless accusations of the involvement in the attempt to explode an Israeli plane, the accusation which the British Government used as a pretext for the anti-Syrian action, the statement says.

TASS on Anti-Syrian 'Campaign'

LD251305 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1132 GMT 25 Oct 86

[Text] London, 25 Oct (TASS) -- Despite the official decision announced yesterday to expel Syria's diplomatic representatives from London in the course of 2 weeks, the British Government announced today that the deadline is being halved. This step is being viewed here as an attempt to give an additional spur to the frenzied anti-Syrian campaign which has been unleashed by the British authorities under the fabricated pretext of some kind of "Syrian involvement in acts of international terrorism." The only grounds for the severing of diplomatic relations with this Arab country were the completely unsupported assertions of a criminal who declared in the course of London court proceedings that his actions had allegedly been "directed" by Syrian officials.

TASS on U.S. Response

LD250719 Moscow TASS in English 0710 GMT 25 Oct 86

[Text] Washington October 25 TASS -- The United States has taken another unfriendly action against Syria.

The White House has officially announced the withdrawal of the U.S. ambassador from Damascus.

An administration spokesman, who accompanies the president in his election tour of the country, has pointed out that this is an extremely serious measure which the United States may resort to without fully serving diplomatic relations with Syria.

According to the spokesman, by this step the adminstration is trying to show its "great displeasure with the country's policies".

Canada Recalls Envoy

LD251340 Moscow TASS in English 1315 GMT 25 Oct 86

[Text] Ottawa October 25 TASS -- Joseph Clark, minister of foreign affairs of Canada, has stated in the House of Commons that the Canadian Government recalls its ambassador to Syria for consultations.

TASS on British Action

LD241857 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1816 GMT 24 Oct 86

[Text] London, 24 Oct (TASS) -- The British Government has decided to break off diplomatic relations with Syria. This was announced by Geoffrey Howe, Great Britain's foreign minister, speaking in Parliament today. He maintained that Syrian officials were implicated in an attempted terrorist act against an aircraft of the Israeli airline in April this year at London's Heathrow airport although, as is well known, the Government of Syria has, on more than one occasion, condemned international terrorism. The Syrian ambassador to Great Britain was summoned today to the Foreign Office and informed of London's decision.

The step by the British Government cannot be seen as anything other than an unprovoked act hostile to Syria. Claiming that Whitehall had "irrefutable proof of impermissible activities" by Syria, G. Howe referred to the "evidence" of a terrorist who tried to plant a bomb on the plane -- a psychologically and mentally deficient man. During the trial, he changed the testimony on more than one occasion. Nevertheless, his unsubstantiated statements turned out to be enough for the British authorities to reach a decision in the taking of which Prime Minister M. Thatcher is reported to have participated in person.

G. Howe also announced a number of other measures unfriendly toward Syria, including a tightening up of control over the activity of the Syrian passenger airline and strict restrictions on the entry of Syrian citizens into the country. London has asked its closest allies to "support" its actions.

The British Government gives as the reason for the break in diplomatic relations its "desire to eradicate terrorism". It is under pretext of a struggle against this that the United States and its allies, including London, themselves step up intrigues against foreign governments and national liberation movements which are not to their liking and intensify repression against dissidents within their own countries.

Observers note that the step taken by Whitehall might boomerang and hit Britain itself. Quoting the opinion of Middle East experts, the REUTER agency points out that breaking off diplomatic relations with Syria will damage London's attempts to play an "active role" in this part of the globe.

UK Action Aids U.S.

LD252015 Moscow TASS in English 1944 GMT 25 Oct 86

[Text] Moscow October 25 TASS -- Follows commentary by Boris Shabeyev, TASS political news analyst:

The Syrian Government has decided to sever diplomatic relations with Britain in answer to London's provocative decision to break off diplomatic relations with Syria. The pretext for that anti-Syrian move has been the unfounded charge that Syria was implicated in the attempt to explode an Israeli plane, which was categorically denied by the Syrian Arab Republic.

It took the British authorities almost half a year to invent a version of the April events in London's Heathrow Airport, which shocked by its absurdity even the experienced BBC commentators. They in the Whitehall have gone so far as to claim that the Syrian ambassador to Britain himself had a hand in preparing that act of terrorism.

It is hard to say for whom that absurd allegation is designed. But it is quite easy to guess whom official London is so much trying to please. The White House did not lose time in issuing a statement to the effect that the U.S. Administration was applauding and supporting Britain's decision. As is reported from Washington, things have not been confined to applause. The U.S. Administration has alredy recalled its ambassador from Damascus, and is planning a whole programme of diplomatic, political and economic sanctions against Syria.

In common with Libya, Syria has already long been a target of open blackmail by Washington, as it is resolutely countering the implementation of U.S.-Israeli hegemonistic plans in the Middle East. The "Heritage Foundation", the brain centre of the U.S. ultras, to whose recommendations the current U.S. Administration lends, as a rule, an attentive ear, openly called in its report for the overthrow of the Syrian leadership. That document contains open advice to Washington to "rely on the lash" in its attitude to Syria.

Washington's aggressive adventurist policy in the Arab east causes concern and at times meets with counteraction, even among many of its NATO allies. But it meets with full support in the Downing Street. That was the case in April this year, when Britain acted as practically an accomplice in the U.S. Air Force piratic raid against Libya. This is also happening now that London is openly playing up to its "senior partner" in fanning a fresh anti-Arab campaign.

One cannot help asking the question whether it was by chance that this moment has been chosen for such an open provocation? There is good reason to believe that this is not so.

After Reykjavik, when the Washington administration has found itself under fire of criticism for its obstructionist stand, which blocked the attainment of truly history-making agreements on a radical cut and subsequent total abolition of nuclear weapons, it and its political supporters clearly needed any pretext to divert world public attention, to switch it over to another, artificially whipped-up problem. And, as is the rule, London was in a hurry to help it.

The policy of the Tory cabinet reduces the British bulldog down to the role of a Reagan poodle, said David Steel, liberal floor leader in the House of Commons. It is certainly up to the Britons themselves to choose in what role they will act. But the consequences of London's policy concern by no means only the foggy Albion.

PRAVDA: UK Action 'Provocative'

PM281021 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 26 Oct 86 First Edition p 5

[Vladimir Peresada "Commentator's Column": "Syria Will Not Be Intimidated"]

[Text] Storm clouds are gathering over Syria. The campaign of blackmail and threats against this Arab country has reached a new high. The British Government announced that it has broken off diplomatic relations and has taken a number of other unfriendly measures. The grounds for these actions were provided by a claim of alleged Syrian complicity in the attempt to blow up an aircraft belonging to the Israeli airline made 6 months ago at London's Heathrow airport.

The British Government offered neither Syria nor the international community any proof, while it simply ignored Damascus' categorical denials. A groundless and blatantly provocative act was thus committed, the Syrian newspaper AL-BA'TH writes.

What was it that actually prompted London's actions? In asking this question, one cannot overlook the fact that they are part and parcel of the multifaceted anti-Syrian noise launched in the West under U.S. leadership. In the words of the U.S. NEWSWEEK magazine, "there is an all-out search for reasons to punish Damascus." But why? Simply because Syria follows an independent anti-imperialist policy which suits neither Washington, nor many of its NATO allies including London, nor the U.S. "strategic ally," Tel Aviv. Attacks on Syria were stepped up in particular during the last few months, when it reaffirmed its resolve to aim for an all-embracing settlement of the Near East conflict.

Syria found itself the target of a scenario which was already used by London's senior partner, Washington, against another Arab country -- Libya. Having backed the U.S. raid on Libya last April, Britain is now copying U.S. actions by tagging the label of "terrorist accomplice" on Syria. It is no accident that Washington immediately approved London's actions and recalled its ambassador from Damascus. Canada's ambassador was also recalled "for consultations." Meanwhile, the French and FRG Governments, just as in the case with Libya, displayed restraint by declaring that they have no similar plans.

Britain's provocative action, clearly coordinated with the United States and Israel, has been met with indignation in Syria. Mass anti-imperialist demonstrations have taken place there. [paragraph continues]

The Syrian people, who have withstood considerable trials, will not be intimated now. The sympathy and solidarity of the broad international public are on their side.

Attempt To Link USSR

LD271854 Moscow Radio Peace and Progress in Arabic 1630 GMT 27 Oct 86

[Text] Dark clouds have begun to gather over Syria. The campaign of threats and intimidation against this Arab country has escalated greatly. The British Government has severed diplomatic relations with the Syrian Arab Republic and adopted a number of other unfriendly measures against it, on the grounds that Syria was connected with the attempt to blow up an Israeli El Al plane about half a year ago at the London Heathrow Airport, though the British Government has failed to provide any proof either to Syria or to the international community in this regard. On the contrary, the British Government has simply ignored Damascus' categorical denial of involvement.

Thus, as the Syrian newspaper AL-BA'TH has stated, this provocative action against Syria had no justification. The hysterical anti-Syrian campaign has been strongly denounced by the Arab countries. The People's Bureau for Foreign Liaison of Libya has strongly denounced the provocative British action. The statement issued by the Libyan Bureau stated that the measures taken by the British Government against Syria is a continuation of the policy of official terrorism practiced by Washington and London against Libya because of its firm stand against imperialism and its call for the support of the just Palestinian people's cause.

Now sovereign Syria has become the target of an unprecedented feverish campaign by the United States and British against it, though the similarity in the acts of blackmail and fabrications used now against the Arab country Syria and those used by London and Washington prior to the armed aggression on the Libyan Jamahiriyah in April indicate that the forces of imperialism and Zionism were preparing for another aggression on another Arab country. There is yet another point which calls for attention: the perpetrators of the hysterical anti-Syria campaign have been trying to impose their double lies on the international community. They not only accuse Syria of a crime it has nothing to do with but try to link the USSR as well with this. The purpose is very clear: to consider the USSR as the principal coordinator of world terrorism. They claim that the Middle Eastern allies of the USSR were responsible for the intensification of violence throughout the world. But the USSR attitude toward this matter is well known to all in the world. Our country firmly denounces all forms of terrorism and all forms of violence which claim the lives of innocent people.

The struggle for peace and the creation of an atmosphere of mutual trust on the international arena are the sublime aim of the Soviet foreign policy. But those who practice the policy of official terrorism in reality and who turn the Middle East into an arena for war and conflict would be unlikely to do so. It is not surprising in this regard that Washington immediately approved London's embarkation on provocation and its withdrawal of its ambassador in Damascus. The United States and Israel have, under the smokescreen of talk about terrorism, been preparing for a new aggression on Syria.

But the Syrian people, who withstood many tough ordeals, cannot be intimidated now. The wide-scale social world circles have also been reiterating support for the Syrian people.

'Intense Anti-Syrian Campaign'

LD280211 Moscow TASS in English 2244 GMT 27 Oct 86

[Text] London October 27 TASS -- TASS correspondent Nikolay Pakhomov reports:

The British Government which has severed diplomatic relations with Damascus is conducting an intense anti-Syrian campaign aimed at achieving the isolation of Syria in the international arena.

According to the PRESS ASSOCIATION news agency, Geoffrey Howe, British secretary of state for foreign and commonwealth affairs, took to the regular session of the EEC Council of Ministers on the level of foreign ministers that opened in Luxembourg today a long list of stern demands to the partners, urging them to join the anti-Syrian measures of London.

PRESS ASSOCIATION pointed out that the least that Britain wanted from its EEC partners was to demonstrate solidarity by discontinuing flights of their planes to Damascus and reducing the personnel of Syria's diplomatic missions in Western Europe.

At the same time, Whitehall hints that Britain can take additional measures against Syria if the latter does not reconsider its decision to prohibit the use of its air space by British planes.

However, by all appearances, most of Britain's allies are not eager to follow its example and take tough, totally unjustified measures against Syria which they regard as a major political force in the Middle East. So far only the U.S. and Canada announced the recalling of their ambassadors from Damascus.

As for West European countries, Howe is facing a difficult task: to persuade the partners to take at least economic measures against Syria, PRESS ASSOCIATION pointed out. According to REUTER, France expresses no desire whatsoever to take hostile steps against Damascus.

The GUARDIAN wrote today that the West European partners of Britain displayed interest rather in avoiding the involvement in the present conflict with Syria provoked by London, than in taking part in it.

FURTHER REPORT, COMMENT ON DEATH OF MACHEL

Aliyev Meets Nicaraguan

LD271306 Moscow TASS in English 1241 GMT 27 Oct 86

[Text] Maputo October 27 TASS -- Geydar Aliyev, member of the Political Bureau of the CPSU Central Committee, first deputy chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers, met here today Sergio Ramierez, vice president of the Republic of Nicaragua, who arrived in Mozambique to attend the funeral of Samora Machel.

The sides expressed solidarity with the leadership of the Frelimo [Mozambique Liberation Front] party, the Government of the People's Republic of Mozambique and the Mozambican people in their struggle against the intrigues by racist South Africa and its Western patrons, for the consolidation of Mozambique's national independence and sovereign rights.

During the conversation that passed in a warm and comradely atmosphere, Geydar Aliyev and Sergio Ramirez touched upon some questions of the international situation and Soviet-Nicaraguan relations. Sergio Ramirez spoke highly of Mikhail Gorbachev's initiative and principled position at the Reykjavik meeting and stated Nicaragua's unreserved support for the Soviet initiatives.

PRAVDA on South Africa Role

PM271415 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 27 Oct 86 First Edition p 5

[TASS report: "Doubtful Republic of South Africa [RSA] Version"]

[Text] Maputo, 28 Oct -- The Government of the People's Republic of Mozambique does not rule out the possibility that the racist RSA authorities were involved in the tragic death of Samora Machel, chairman of the Frelimo Party and the country's president, Teodato Hnguana, Mozambican minister of information, said here. The RSA, he stressed, is now zealously spreading the claim that the air disaster happened as a result of an error on the part of the crew and bad weather conditions. However, the minister noted, there is reason to suppose that what we have here is a carefully planned crime.

TASS on Circumstances of Crash

LD272003 Moscow TASS in English 1906 GMT 27 Oct 86

[Text] Maputo October 27 TASS -- TASS correspondent Yuriy Pichugin reports:

The Mozambican people are paying their last respects to Samora Machel, chairman of the Frelimo Party, president of the People's Republic of Mozambique.

The circumstances of the air crash over the territory of South Africa close to the Mozambican border which claimed the life of this prominent leader of the national liberation movement, African statesman and politican were not made clear to the full so far.

According to Kenneth Kaunda, president of Zambia, it is the result of the policy of state terrorism and aggression with regard to the neighbouring independent countries which is being pursued by the racist regime of Pretoria. Leaders of other "frontline" countries and national liberation movements, as well as many statesmen and public figures of Africa, share this view.

Reports appear in the press about the direct complicity of South Africa in the air crash. Newspapers call attention to the fact that it was preceded by a fierce anti-Mozambican campaign in South Africa that went along with open threats to the president of Mozambique.

Just several days before the death of Samora Machel, Malan, defense minister of South Africa, attacked Mozambique and accused it of patronizing 'terrorists' (this is how Pretoria describes patriots of the African National Congress of South Africa). In his openly instigatory speech he foretold the 'inevitable collapse' of the Mozambican Government. The news Agency of Mozambique (AIM) described it, and with good reason, as preparations for the assassination of the Mozambican president.

The psychological war went together with the massive concentration of South African troops along the Mozambican border, the growth of arms deliveries by air to the terroristic gangs of the so-called 'Mozambican National Resistance' and the stepping up of their activities. The purpose of all those coordinated actions was to reach the strategic target for which Pretoria had aimed for ten years: To topple the Machel government and to place in power its puppets there.

During that period the damage inflicted on Mozambique as a result of economic sabotage, acts of subversion and aggression exceeded five billion dollars. When these actions failed to influence the principled stand of Mozambique with regard to apartheid, Pretoria started to draw up plans for physical destruction of the leader of the Frelimo Party and the Mozambican state.

RPP Discusses Causes of Crash

LD242218 Moscow Radio Peace and Progress in English 1630 GMT 24 Oct 86

[Unattributed commentary]

[Text] The people of Mozambique are shaken over the tragic death of President Samora Machel and together with them the pain of the terrible loss is being felt by the public of independent Africa, by all friends of the African people, including the Soviet people. Appraising this sad tragedy one cannot help note that the catastrophe with the airliner in which the president was flying had occurred at a time when the most reactionary forces had taken up arms against Mozambique. These forces want to destroy the independence of the republic and put an end to the revolutionary gains of the Mozambican people.

The reasons for the catastrophe that occurred to the airliner have still not been determined and much remains unclear. But even today it is perfectly apparent that it could not have occurred due to any ordinary disruption. President Samora Machel and those accompanying him were flying with a plane that certainly was thoroughly checked.

This is reaffirmed by the high authority enjoyed by the firm that manufactures the TU passenger planes used on international air routes. The safety on these planes cannot in any way be compared to that of the so-called concern shown to passengers who fly aboard various modifications of Boeing and DC (?planes). It is common knowledge that, on diverse occasions, due to serious defects, the planes of these firms have been taken off from flights for long periods of time. It is also well known how often accidents had occurred on the planes of these manufacturers in flights from Paris to Istanbul, Nairobi, or New Delhi, bringing death to hundreds of passengers who had trusted Western airlines. In the light of these facts it is not surprising that the Soviet public pays special attention to news that quotes racist South Africa as the source and reports from there indicate that before the plane aboard which President Samora Machel was flying had crashed an explosion occurred in the central part of the plane's fuselage. The reliability of this report is confirmed by the fact that some passengers sitting in the front and back of the plane remained alive and one of thes passengers declared that, just before the plane started falling he heard a noise that sounded like a gun had been fired. The impression was created that there was shooting aboard.

It is not accidental that the Pretoria authorities, with the help of all sorts of doubtful claims, are trying to confuse the matter. In particular, they claim the plane had allegedly crashed during a storm, although the inhabitants of the surrounding area declared that there wasn't even a small rain at the time. However, just before the tragedy, as noted by the French newspaper LIBERATION, the highway leading to the town of Komatipoort witnessed feverish activities by the South African troops. There are all indications that those political observers are correct who consider that those responsible for this criminal action should be sought among the South African military. Moreover, they recall that several days before the death of Samora Machel, the director of the country's news agency, Carlos Cardoso, drew attention to the threats emanating from the racist Defense Minister General Malan, and his threats were promptly taken up by the South African press. This propaganda hullabaloo, in the opinion of the director, was meant to prepare the ground for the killing of the head of the Mozambican state.

Today, Pretoria is openly being accused of complicity in the tragedy. This tragedy, said the Zambian President Kenneth Kaunda, was planned by South Africa and his opinion is shared by many African leaders. Moreover, one can hardly doubt the correctness of their opinion. It will be recalled that for several years already the Pretoria authorities have been pursuing a course of annihilating activists of the anti-apartheid movement, and not only in the country. Their tentacles have stretched to neighboring countries where they are in emigraton. We know quite a number of cases when bombs sent in packages by post were the cause of death to prominent anti-racist fighters in Mozambique, Zambia, and other countries. The South African rulers are following a road of state sponsored terrorsim and this fact already needs no investigations and confirmation. What is needed is to repulse it.

'LAW AND ORDER' BECOMES NEW CHERNOBYL CONCERN

Property Policing Stepped Up

PM271253 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 27 Oct 86 First Edition p 2

[Unattributed report: "'Zone of Special Attention'"]

[Text] The article "Zone of Special Attention" published on 18 August was discussed at a Ukrainian SSR MVD collegium session, V. Durdinets, acting Ukrainian SSR minister of internal affairs, has informed the editorial office. The criticism leveled at the republic's MVD organs has been acknowledged as justified.

V. Skopich, deputy chief of the Chernobyl Rayon Internal Affairs Department, has received a severe reprimand for failing to properly organize work to protect citizens' private property. V. Bovsunovskiy, deputy chief of the Kiev Oblispolkom Internal Affairs Administration, has had disciplinary charges brought against him. The Ukrainian SSR MVD collegium and the Kiev Oblispolkom have jointly worked out and are now implementing additional measures to strengthen law and order in the zone.

Protection of the entire zone perimeter has been stepped up. The service procedure has been changed: Militia members have been personally assigned to every population center from which the population has been evacuated and round-the-clock patrolling by duty groups has been organized. A large proportion of buildings and homes in the cities of Pripyat and Chernobyl have been attached to centralized protection points. Regular detailed inspections of economic installations, residential blocks, and other buildings are carried out and they are then sealed again. A number of persons who penetrated the 30-km zone without authorization and also some of those who were working in the zone have been exposed and had criminal charges brought against them for stealing citizens' private property.

People evacuated from Chernobyl, Pripyat, and adjacent villages are now being given the opportunity to visit their homes and apartments and satisfy themselves that the property they have left is intact. Internal affairs organs are giving them every possible assistance and expeditiously checking out incoming alert. The leaders of the Ukrainian SSR MVD, the Kiev Oblispolkom Internal Affairs Administration, the Pripyat City Internal Affairs Department, and the Chernobyl Rayon Internal Affairs Department are holding meetings with the evacuated population everywhere and explaining the measures being taken by internal affairs organs to ensure law and order and the protection of citizens' private property.

USSR MVD and Ukrainian SSR MVD operational groups are constantly in the AES zone, coordinating work to reinforce the permit procedure, the protection of socialist property and citizens' private property, and road and fire safety.

The first power unit is already operating under test conditions. But the AES region remains a special zone. Staffers of the internal affairs organs are among those for whom the special zone is their place of work.

"Militia and fire protection subunits are still on duty in the AES region and the adjacent zone, ensuring that reliable law and order are maintained there," V.V. Durdinets, Ukrainian SSR first deputy minister of internal affairs, said. "Militia detachments are on constant patrol in the special zone and population centers in the zone. Technical means are being used on a wide scale to protect state and cooperative facilities, apratment blocks, and apartments."

Staffers of the Pripyat City and Chernobylskiy Rayon Internal Affairs Departments, the State Motor Vehicle Inspection Administration highway patrol service, and combined fire protection detachments are working in difficult conditions here. At the same time, life has shown that not everything has yet been done to completely eliminate all encroachments on state and personal property. This applies above all to those rural regions from which people have been evacuated. There are still individual instances of lawbreakers entering population centers in the special zone. As a rule, such crimes come to light "while the trail is still hot."

...One night an alarm call from the "Pripyat" cafe reached the duty desk of the Pripyat City Militia Department. The first though was that the alarm signal had gone off by itself. Nevertheless, an arrest group promptly went to the scene of the incident. Unfortunately, it was not a false alert. Power station workers Gurkin, Chaykovskiy, and Kovalenko were in the cafe. There was no doubting the purpose of their "visit" -- a radio-tape player and bags containing packets of cigaretts and candy were discovered nearby. This crime was organized by Zaychenko, foreman of the heating and underground supply lines shop. Militia workers thwarted a similar attempted burglary in Novyye Shepelichi village. Kukovets, a resident of that village, claimed that he went there to check that his property was safe. Taking advantage of the fact that he knew the area well, he deliberately entered the zone. After ascertaining that his own house was in order he decided to see how "safe" his neighbors' property was. Militia Lieutenants A.I. Semenenko and V.V. Polulyakh, divisional inspectors of the Pripyat City Department, caught Kukovets trying to force open locked doors.

Criminal proceedings have been instituted against all the lawbreakers. Such incidents are isolated ones, of course, but they cannot be discussed without concern. Indeed, those who try to get rich on other people's misfortunes have committed a double or a triple crime.

The Ukrainian SSR MVD Collegium, in conjunction with Kiev Oblispolkom, has formulated additional measures to strengthen law and order and the security of property in the Chernobyl AES zone. To that end militia staffers have been assigned to every population center in the zone. In addition, round-the-clock patrols are in operation in those places. Homestead and apartment block inspections are carried out in conjunction with the deputies' aktiv and the public. The militia provides comprehensive assistance to citizens who want to take part in organized visits to their homes and apartments to see for themselves that their property is safe and sound.

Staffers of the Department for Combating the Embezzlement of Socialist Property and Speculation are also at work in the special zone. Painstakingly they have inspected national economic facilities, bases, trade enterprises, the reception centers of consumer combines, construction and other organizations to ensure the protection and safekeeping of the people's property.

With the participation of representatives of this service, material assets worth several million rubles have already been removed from Pripyat and Chernobyl following the appropriate radiation check.

But at the same time, V.V. Durdinets stressed, it must be said that there are certain trade or supply organization workers who have been trying to "cash in" on the common misfortune. For instance, Ostrovskiy, former cook of the "Odessa" restaurant in Kiev received produce to organize hot meals for the people working in the AES zone, but sold it even before it had arrived at its destination. Criminal proceeding were instituted against him. It was the money-grubbing mentality which landed Skuba, former director of the Borodyanskiy retail trade enterprise, in the dock.

The words "discipline," "organization," and "order" are acquiring a special meaning in Chernobyl today. Selfishness and complacency are especially intolerable.

ECONOMISTS DISCUSS ROLE OF TAX IN INCOME SPHERE

PM261438 Moscow EKONOMICHESKAYA GAZETA in Russian No. 42, Oct 86 (Signed to Press 9 Oct 86) pp 1, 4

[Article by S. Shatalin, corresponding member of the USSR Academy of Sciences, and Candidate of Economic Sciences V. Grebennikov under the rubric "Problems of Acceleration": "Personal Incomes, Taxes, and Social Justice"]

[Text] Social policy in the distribution sphere is multifaceted. It is not restricted to just the planned management of the processes of shaping the population's primary incomes, earned on the basis of distribution according to labor and from social consumption funds, private subsidiary plots, and other types of individual labor activity. Its task also involves the regulation of the process of shaping the population's ultimate incomes resulting from the redistribution of primary incomes. Taxation policy is an important instrument of this regulation.

The Taxation System's Role [subhead]

The problem of improving the system of socialist taxation of the population is highly complex. Considerations of the need to introduce radical measures in this sphere are closely interwoven with a number of specifically practical aspects stemming from the conditions of the given stage of socioeconomic development and prevailing trends. Importance also attaches to the level of development of the system for assessing personal incomes and the property owned by citizens, and other similar technical limitations on the introduction of various taxes.

The problem is also complicated by the fact that these fundamental principles can be substantiated only simultaneously with the definition of a comprehensive concept of the economic machinery's improvement. Take for example the question of abolishing or retaining wages tax. This question is both theoretically and practically interconnected with the elaboration of principles and forms to improve labor remuneration and with the determination of the extent of labor collectives' independence in the formation and distribution of the wages fund. The methods of financial mutual relations between associations and enterprises and the budget are also important here. Therefore, the topical problem of improving taxation policy, which was raised in the CPSU Central Committee Political Report to the 27th party congress, demands creative discussion.

We are far from holding that problems which are most topical from the social viewpoint can be resolved on the basis of measures in the taxation system sphere. These include, for example, the rectification of the low-income status of a number of population groups, the establishment of balance between money incomes and commodities in the economy's consumer sector, additional assistance to pensioners, and the development of the social and cultural complex. We are talking rather about regularizing socioeconomic relations in the sphere of income distribution and ultimate utilization, about bringing them into line with the contemporary conditions of our country's development.

It is well known that the following types of taxes are now collected from the population:

-- income tax, payable on all types of incomes originating in the public sector economy;
-- agricultural tax, payable from incomes resulting from the production of output on private subsidiary farms;
--taxes payable from incomes resulting from various types of individual activity in the provision of services;
-- the tax on bachelors, people living on their own, and citizens with small families.

The state budget received R30 billion from the population in the form of taxes in 1985, representing 7.7 percent of revenues. Payment of taxes is an economic action linked with the transformation of the population's nominal incomes into real incomes which can be used to pay for the acquisition of a certain volume of paid material consumer goods and services. The difference between real and nominal incomes also includes an amount equal to voluntary payments and contributions made to different public organizations and for various social needs. The size of real incomes is also largely affected by the level of retail prices for material consumer goods and charges for paid services.

The path that has been taken now to solve the problem, when income tax is not collected from workers earning a minimum wage whose level is steadily rising, appears the most justified one from a socioeconomic viewpoint.

Direct income tax on the wages of workers and employees whose remuneration is above the set minimum is a method of redistributing one part of incomes to the benefit of low-paid workers, because in this way their participation in the formation of funds for all-state expenditure is "reduced."

This function of taxation is, of course, limited by the specifically historical conditions of development. The grounds for such redistricution disappear as the prosperity of all groups and strata in society grows and the system of social guarantees based on social consumption funds is consolidated.

But, in our view, it is incorrect to conclude from this that there are no grounds at all for the taxation of personal incomes from activity in the public sector economy and that it must be abolished. This form of tax performs another function under socialism -- that of income regulation whose significance does not diminish but, on the contrary, could increase, bearing in mind the objective trends in the economic machinery's development and the practical steps being taken today to improve it.

The Principle of Progressiveness [subhead]

Being the subject of ownership by the whole people, the socialist state has at its disposal a two-fold method for the balanced formation of funds for all-state expenditure and for the conduct of social policy in the sphere of differentiation of real incomes and incentives for the labor activeness by workers and employees.

This is, first, direct management in the sphere of labor remuneration -- through the wage scale system, the planning of wages funds and workers' material incentives funds from profits, and the imposition of rules and regulations governing the expenditure of funds on labor remuneration.

Second, the progressive taxation of wages is an additional means for regulating the real incomes of workers and employees. Its importance is growing under the conditions of the economic machinery's improvement. Indeed, enterprises are being given broader economic independence and their rights in the formation and distribution of the labor remuneration funds are being expanded.

The logic of this process inevitably brings about, in parallel with indisputably positive advances in the implementation of the principles of socialist distribution according to labor, also a number of attendant factors of a, so to speak, specifically local and short-term nature, which are difficult to control. Their effect may not always be desirable from the social and economic viewpoints. For example, specific features of the formation of personal incomes may encourage the irrational transfer of cadres to neighboring enterprises offering better remuneration conditions and may create instances of socially excessive gaps in earnings.

The likely emergence of such phenomena cannot, of course, be an argument for rejecting new methods of economic management based on the vast potential contained in the real, economically interested, and economically responsible initiative of labor collectives. But this likelihood must be borne in mind and "neutralized" as much as possible by using means of state influence at the secondary stage of the formation of personal incomes in the wages sector -- through the transformation of monetary wages into real incomes via progressive taxation. The purpose of this tax is to compensate for shortcomings arising in connection with the formation of labor remuneration in the upper half of the scale. The actual nature of the function of this tax indicates that the minimum wage not liable to taxation must be substantially higher than at present and, in our view, nearer to the average wage level. This is why it appears necessary to apply the principle of progressive taxation in this narrow sphere more firmly.

Of course, in terms of importance and effect on social and economic processes, the improvement of wage taxation cannot be compared with the development of new methods for economic incentives. But taxes could effectively supplement these methods in ensuring normal socioeconomic conditions for reproduction. In particular, it appears necessary to test in practice various methods of combining wage taxes with budget payments by enterprises depending on the size of the fund earmarked for satisfying workers' personal needs (total wages and relevant expenditure from profits).

The retention of wage taxation (with stepped up progressiveness) could become an effective incentive for savings in highly skilled and highly paid labor and will become much more necessary if there is an expansion of the machinery of the population's secondary employment through the multiple employment system and participation in individual labor activity.

Bearing in mind the lofty social prestige and unique nature of the outstanding examples of creative labor, income redistribution through taxes would definitely be preferable to a straightforward revision of the conditions for remunerating this labor with a view to income "restraint." What are the likely solutions here? In order to ensure that the methods of the redistribution of large incomes receive greater public response and yield the maximum social effect, it could be possible to relieve the relevant individuals from taxes subject to voluntary payment of part of their earnings to creative foundations to be set up on public principles. These sums could be used, for example, for the payment of scholarships, the rental of exhibition premises, and the acquisition of paintings and other valuable exhibits from owners of personal collections. Other ways to solve the problem are also possible.

The suggested measures for stepping up the redistribution processes for the given category of very large incomes do not mean that such incomes must be treated as a particular social problem necessitating extraordinary and extreme actions. Such incomes are a completely permissible phenomenon in a society which highly values its creative intelligentsia. It seems that the practice of additional progressive taxation in the far from typical instances of particularly large incomes would be equally normal and correctly understood by all. The same could also be said about the need for progressive taxation of very large inheritances. The importance of this question was noted at the 27th CPSU Congress.

Taxation Regulation of Different Incomes [subhead]

Substantial improvement is needed in taxation policy with respect to incomes from activities outside the public sector economy. This applies, of course, only to incomes from permissible activity outside the framework of the state sector and the kolkhoz-cooperative sector -- from private subsidiary farms, cottage trade workshops, and provision of various services to the population.

The function of taxes here boils down to ensuring the application of the requirements of the law on distribution according to the quantity and quality of labor in spheres of labor activity outside the public sector economy. This would also ensure working people's equal participation (in the socioeconomic sense) in the formation of funds for all-state expenditure, including social consumption funds.

Supplementary income in addition to normative labor remuneration in the state sector and the kolkhoz-cooperative sector, which becomes possible through the effect of several factors, is a source of the relevant tax deductions. For example, individual producers of agricultural output could obtain very high rent incomes as a result of more favorable natural and climatic conditions or proximity to major cities or population centers. Activity outside the public sector economy is usually liveliest wherever there is a shortage of consumer goods and services through sluggishness on the part of state and cooperative organizations or shortages of resources for them. This is why individual producers can take advantage of favorable market demand by setting relatively high prices.

The taxation of incomes from activity outside the public sector economy also performs the function of an indirect economic regulator of such activity by means of incentives or restrictions. For example, the rate of tax on incomes from private subsidiary farms must take into account the current food situation and ensure interest in the sale of excess output from these farms to outsiders. It may even become necessary to retain a part of the rent income of individual producers. [paragraph continues]

But should it become necessary to restrict various types of individual labor activity, taxes may be used to reduce the income generated by them below the socially normal level of labor remuneration in the state sector and the kolkhoz-cooperative sector.

The system of collecting agricultural tax on incomes from the private subsidiary farms of kolkhoz members, workers, and employees was imposed in 1953 and, of course, the tax rates now need improvement. The socialist state's taxation activity with respect to private subsidiary farms must obviously be based on two main principles. First, now there is no doubt about the need for financial and organizational-economic backing for this type of individual economic activity by the population. Second, it is necessary to prevent any likelihood of this activity developing to the detriment of society at the expense of the public sector economy.

Fundamental importance attaches to the question of high incomes from private subsidiary farms as a result of their advantageous location -- proximity of roads and cities, use of particularly fertile soil, and so on. In our view, a uniform agricultural tax could ensure a fuller collection of those elements of monopoly rent income gained in such instances by individual producers.

The rates of agricultural tax should not, of course, render such activity economically disadvantageous, because this would hurt the producer, the consumer, and ultimately the socialist society. Here, just as in social policy as a whole, it is important to proceed on the basis of real economic possibilities, not to rush ahead, and not to use any artificial measures, which people often try to justify by loftier considerations of social justice but which, in fact, only slow down the pace of economic growth and the enhancement of the population's living standards.

The 27th CPSU Congress decisions emphasize the need to make broad use of cooperative and individual labor activity in the production of consumer goods and the services sphere, which activity must be organically integrated within the system of socialist social economic management.

To a certain extent, individual labor activity fills the gap in supplying the population with the corresponding services and is implemented by activating reserve sources of labor and material resources. This activity presupposes the appropriate regulation of mutual economic relations between individual producers, the consumers of their services, the state, and the cooperative enterprises and organizations. Income tax on the relevant incomes must be perceived as an important element of this machinery.

It would be purposeful to make the economically substantiated rates of income tax more flexible and to review them periodically with due consideration for the specific situation. It is possible to mention two reasons why it would be better to set income tax on a steep progressive scale.

First, this prevents the switch of tax payments onto the consumer by including them in the price of individual services.

Second, a progressive tax scale is an effective method of removing incomes which stand out from the ordinary and are, as a rule, earned through the effect of factors of a purely market or rent nature.

One more reason. A progressive income tax scale diminishes to a certain extent the need for frequent reviews of tax rates and makes it possible to automatically take current circumstances into account by means of the economic regulation of individual labor activity.

Socialist society still provides frequent instances when people's real situation as regards property, major expensive purchases, and "luxury" consumption which generates social protest are substantially in excess of these persons' economic potential, bearing in mind their level of income from work in the public sector economy. Why are such phenomena possible? The following causes can be listed. These are unearned incomes obtained through what is criminal activity -- speculation, bribery, and squandering of socialist social property. One must also mention incomes generated through economic activity which is not now legalized by society. In principle, they represent remuneration for labor, but remuneration in excess of the usual real norm of labor remuneration. This, generally speaking, is typical of most types of services rendered by one group of the population to another. It is also possible to mention incomes received as a result of property and money inheritance or gifts.

It is obvious that an effective struggle against unearned incomes from speculation and bribery presupposes the use of the most effective instruments of economic, organizational, and legal influence. The success of this work depends to a decisive extent on the elimination of conditions which generate and reproduce unearned incomes. This primarily requires a guaranteed correspondence between the population's effective demand and the availability of consumer goods and paid services and the improvement of the economic machinery.

As for the socialist state's policy toward incomes from individual labor activity, here it is important -- as has already been noted -- to provide an accurate definition of their legal and economic status. The acquisition of such incomes could be organically integrated within the system of social production. In such an event, their nature renders them completely earned incomes. It is necessary that the proportion of labor contribution becomes everywhere an accurate justification of the level of material prosperity by members of society.

The creation of a thoroughly thought out system of assessing the population's final incomes could become an effective method for such regulation.

Society is entitled to demand an accounting of the funds used to acquire the material goods in private ownership. The creation of an organizational and legal machinery for this purpose would definitely provide a yardstick for the implementation of social justice and would hit the spongers, bribe-takers, speculators, and other social parasites. Such a measure would provide a basis for conducting an active redistribution policy and step up the effect of the entire income distribution system on the acceleration of our society's socioeconomic development.

UKRAINE'S MASIK 'TRANSFERRED TO ANOTHER JOB'

AU240947 Kiev PRAVDA UKRAILNY in Russian 18 Oct 86 p 1

[Text] The Ukrainian Supreme Soviet Presidium has relieved Comrade Konstantin Ivanovich Masik of his duties as Ukrainian Council of Ministers chairman in connection with his transfer to another job.

OCTOBER SATELLITE LAUNCHINGS REPORTED

Cosmos-1786, 1787 Launched

PM231445 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 23 Oct 86 First Edition p 3

[Text] Moscow, 22 Oct (TASS) -- The lastest artificial earth satellites Cosmos-1786 and Cosmos-1787 were launched in the Soviet Union today.

The satellites carry scientific apparatus for continuing space research.

The satellite Cosmos-1786 has been place in an orbit with the following parameters: initial period of revolution -- 113.3 minutes; apogee -- 2589 km; perigee 190 km; orbital inclination -- 64.9 degrees. [Moscow IZVESTIYA Russian version on 24 October gives perigee as 198 km. This same figure is given in TASS Russian and English versions, 22 October.]

The satellite Cosmos-1787 has been placed in an orbit with the following parameters: initial period of revolution -- 89.3 minutes; apogee -- 290 km; perigee -- 215 km; orbital inclination -- 70.0 degrees.

The apparatus on board the satellites is working normally.

Cosmos-1788 Launched 27 Oct

LD280739 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 0710 GMT 28 Oct 86

[Text] Moscow, 28 Oct (TASS) -- Another artificial earth satellite, Cosmos-1788, was launched in the Soviet Union on 17 October 1986.

The satellite carries scientific apparatus for continuing space research.

The satellite has been place in an orbit with the following parameters:

Initial period of revolution, 94.5 mins; apogee 520 km; perigee 472 km; orbital inclination 65.9 degrees.

The apparatus aboard the satellite is working normally.

Raduga Satellite Launched

PM271001 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 28 Oct 86 First Edition p 3

[TASS report: "Satellite Launched"]

[Text] Another "Raduga" communications satellite carrying relay equipment to provide telephone-telegraph radio communications and transmit television broadcasts was launched in the Soviet Union 25 October.

The "Raduga" satellite has been placed in a near-stationary circular orbit with the following initial parameters: distance from the surface of the Earth -- 36,618 km; period of rotation around the Earth -- 24 hours 39 minutes; inclination of orbit -- 1.3 degrees.

The satellite equipment is functioning normally. The satellite is controlled by an instrumentation control system. The satellite's communications and television equipment will be operated in accordance with a planned program.

SPACE PROJECT TO RESEARCH MERCURY'S MOONS

NC230933 Moscow in Persian to Iran 1800 GMT 28 Sep 86

[From the "In the Soviet Union" program]

[Text] Preparations are underway for a historic space project. It has been decided that in the summer of 1988, two space vehicles will be launched from the Soviet space center in (Balkonor), in the Kazakh SSR, just a few days apart from one another, to engage in research involving the planet Mercury and its moons. These vehicles will reach their distant destination after 200 days of flight.

The undertaking has been named the Subok project, in honor of one of the moons of the planet Mercury. Vyacheslav Balibanov, deputy chief of the Space Research Institute, has informed us that the most interesting aspect of the project will occur in April 1989, when automatic scanners will (?approach) Subok at a (?distance) of 30-50 meters and will activate their automatic long-range transmitters in that [word indistinct]. This equipment will directly transmit information about the mysterious moon. Subok will also be illuminated with laser beams, as a result of which its soil and rock formations will be revealed. Experts believe that research into the moon Subok will help us to solve the riddle of the origin of the solar system and of the earth.

PROTON ROCKET CARRIERS TO BE SOLD COMMERCIALLY

LD240130 Moscow World Service in English 1900 GMT 24 Oct 86

[Text] The Soviet Union is going to offer its proton carrier rockets to other countries on commercial grounds for launching research satellites to carry out scientific experiments for peaceful purposes. The Soviet external trade agency, Litsenzintorg, has started negotiations on the issue. The Proton carrier rocket has a payload of about 20 tons. Companies in more than 20 countries have taken interest in the Soviet offer, including in Britain, Belgium, Italy, France, and Finland.

ANTARCTIC EXPEDITION TO SET UP NEW BASE

LD261305 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1213 GMT 26 Oct 86

[Text] Moscow, 26 Oct (TASS) -- Find the Soviet Antarctic station Druzhnaya-1, evacuate the equipment from it, and choose a plce to set up the Druzhnaya-3 base. That is the task set for the participants in the 32d Soviet Antarctic expedition who have left for the southern hemisphere. The Druzhnaya-1 polar base, which had been mothballed for the antarctic winter, is on a giant iceberg that broke off the Filchner Shelf Glacier.